

# Spectral density functions and their sum rules in an effective chiral field theory

S. P. Klevansky

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Heidelberg,  
Philosophenweg 19, D-69120, Heidelberg, Germany.*

R. H. Lemmer<sup>†</sup>

*Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, Postfach 10 39 80,  
D-69029 Heidelberg, Germany  
(February 1, 2008)*

## Abstract

The validity of Weinberg's two sum rules for massless QCD, as well as the six additional sum rules introduced into chiral perturbation theory by Gasser and Leutwyler, are investigated for the extended Nambu-Jona-Lasinio chiral model that includes vector and axial vector degrees of freedom. A detailed analysis of the vector, axial vector and coupled pion plus longitudinal axial vector modes is given. We show that, under Pauli-Villars regularization of the meson polarization amplitudes that determine the spectral density functions, all of the sum rules involving inverse moments higher than zero are automatically obeyed by the model spectral densities. By contrast, the zero moment sum rules acquire a non-vanishing right hand side that is proportional to the quark condensate density of the non-perturbative ground-state. We use selected sum rules in conjunction with other calculations to obtain explicit expressions for the scale-independent coupling constants  $\bar{l}_i$  of chiral perturbation theory in the combination  $\bar{l}_i + \ln(m_\pi^2/\mu^2)$ , to evaluate the Das-Guralnik-Mathur-Low-Young current algebra expression for the electromagnetic mass difference of the pion, and to compute the pion electrical polarizability  $\alpha_E$ . The sum rule calculations set an upper limit of  $\alpha_E \leq \alpha/(8\pi^2 m_\pi f_\pi^2) \approx 6 \times 10^{-4} \text{fm}^3$  on this quantity, that is independent of the quark mass up to  $\mathcal{O}(m_\pi^2/m^2)$ , and *only* depends on the fundamental constants: pion mass  $m_\pi$  and pion decay constant  $f_\pi$ , in addition to fine structure constant  $\alpha \approx 1/137$ .

No. of manuscript pages: 100; No. of tables: 7; No. of figures: 21.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Our present knowledge of the low energy hadronic spectra and the properties thereof is based on the premise that chiral symmetry is a good approximate symmetry of the underlying quantum chromodynamics (QCD) Lagrangian. This has found verification time and again in understanding the nature of the low-lying octet of pseudoscalar mesons in particular. Computational methods have been developed primarily in two complementary directions. On the one hand, the current algebra tools of the 1960's [1] plus the two sum rules of Weinberg [2,3] attempt to address the properties of the QCD Lagrangian *per se* in the perturbative regime. On the other, the chiral perturbation theory (CHPT) approach [4–6], which is based on an effective Lagrangian that only contains mesonic degrees of freedom, addresses the low-energy non-perturbative regime of QCD. The latter approach introduces terms into this Lagrangian in an expansion in momenta. The unknown coefficients of these terms in each order of the expansion, which in the two flavor case amount to ten in total, have to be fixed by experimentally measurable quantities.

An effective model approach of describing the low energy sector *ab initio* in terms of quark degrees of freedom has also been studied for some years now in the so-called Nambu–Jona-Lasinio (NJL) model [7–13]. In its original two flavor formulation, the minimal version of this model contains scalar and pseudoscalar fields in a chirally symmetric combination, and the model only has three parameters: the (strong) coupling  $G_1$ , an averaged current quark mass  $\hat{m} = (m_u^0 + m_d^0)/2$ , and a cutoff  $\Lambda$  that sets the scale of the theory. Mesons are constructed as collective excitations within this model, and the Goldstone theorem is fulfilled in the chiral limit. The spontaneous breakdown of chiral symmetry leads to a dynamically generated quark mass. In addition, it can easily be demonstrated within the framework of this model that the Goldberger-Treiman and Gell-Mann–Oakes–Renner relations are fulfilled, and that the quark axial current is conserved. In addition, Dashen's theorem [14] that prevents a chiral neutral pion from acquiring a mass shift in the presence of an electromagnetic field, also continues to be obeyed [15]. These properties, which are a consequence of chiral symmetry, continue to hold in an extended version of the NJL model or ENJL model, as we will abbreviate it [8,13]. In this extended model, the vector and axial vector degrees of freedom are explicitly included, and an additional (strong) coupling strength  $G_2$  is required in order to couple these modes into the Lagrangian. It is imperative in demonstrating that the expected properties of chiral symmetry hold, that a suitable regularization scheme be employed under which the relevant Ward identities continue to hold [15,16].

The primary purpose of this paper is to investigate the sum rules of both the Weinberg

type [2] and also those introduced by Gasser and Leutwyler [5]. These sum rules involve, *inter alia* the vector as well as axial vector spectral densities, and thus it appears necessary in regarding a quark model, to have such degrees of freedom explicitly supported. Hence our interest in using the ENJL model for this purpose. However, the application of this model to this problem is fraught with difficulties. On the one hand, the identification of the vector and axial vector meson modes with the physical  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  mesons is especially problematic, and we will return to comment on their analysis somewhat later on in this introduction. We turn first rather to the issue of the spectral functions themselves. We note that either version of the NJL model constitutes an effective field theory that does not confine the explicit quark degrees of freedom that it contains. Consequently one expects the strength distributions of the meson spectra, which contain interacting quark-antiquark pairs, to behave unphysically in the high energy domain. This domain is naturally important if the sum rules are to work. However, in spite of these deficiencies, one can show explicitly [17] that under the Pauli-Villars (PV) regularization of the amplitudes, Weinberg's first sum rule

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s)) = f_\pi^2, \quad (1.1)$$

is obeyed exactly, while the second one satisfies a modified equation,

$$\int_0^\infty ds (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s)) = -m \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle \neq 0. \quad (1.2)$$

Both statements hold to leading order in the number of colors. Here  $f_\pi$  is the pion decay constant, and  $m$  and  $\langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle$  are the quark mass and scalar quark condensate in the ground state. These conclusions also hold for the minimal version of the NJL model. This is perhaps all the more surprising, since the minimal version does not support either vector mode as a fundamental excitation, so that it contains no resonance structures of any kind in these channels.

Besides the two Weinberg sum rules, we are able to demonstrate that the six additional sum rules introduced by Gasser and Leutwyler are also obeyed by the spectral densities of the ENJL model. However, these results come at a price: as pointed out in [18], for example, the Pauli-Villars regularization procedure effectively introduces additional spinor fields that may correspond to indefinite metric sectors of the Hilbert space. In the present case, the use of the PV procedure leads to negative and therefore unphysical spectral densities at large momentum transfers. However, this occurs in such a fashion as to give an overall result that is in accordance with the sum rule. We thus interpret the, perhaps unexpected, continued validity of the sum rules under these circumstances as a consequence of the underlying chiral symmetry and its faithful representation in the Pauli-Villars regularization method.

The results obtained from the ENJL model fall naturally under scrutiny with regard to their accordance or lack thereof with chiral perturbation theory. The retention of the sum rules in both approaches suggests that there could be considerable overlap in these results. In fact, the ENJL model provides a dynamical basis for calculating the empirical Gasser-Leutwyler coupling constants of chiral perturbation theory. We evaluate these constants in both the NJL and ENJL models, and express them as far as possible in terms of the physically measurable parameters  $f_\pi$  and  $g_A$ , the quark axial form factor. One finds that one additional physically non-measurable quantity, the (constituent) quark mass  $m$ , also occurs in these expressions, giving them this single parameter dependence. However, since the calculations of all quantities within the ENJL model have only been performed to leading order  $\mathcal{O}(N_c)$  in the number of colors, one has to identify the calculated coefficients with the Gasser-Leutwyler constants with some care. The reason for this is that the physically meaningful scale-independent constants  $\bar{l}_i$  of Gasser and Leutwyler are not well-defined in the chiral limit, where they diverge logarithmically with vanishing pion mass. This comes about due to the appearance of chiral logarithms in CHPT that are to be anticipated on general grounds [19]. In either version of the NJL model, such chiral logarithms appear as a part of the  $(1/N_c)$  non-chiral corrections that necessarily include mesons in intermediate states [20,15]. Thus we must identify the coefficients obtained from the model calculations with the *renormalized*  $l_i^r$ 's of Gasser and Leutwyler, that have a well-defined chiral limit, and not directly with the  $\bar{l}_i$  as is commonly done (see [21] and further references cited therein<sup>1</sup>). We do this here. In this way, predictions can be obtained for the combinations

$$\bar{l}_i + \ln(m_\pi^2/\mu^2) \sim l_i^r. \quad (1.3)$$

Here the mass  $\mu$  is a scale parameter introduced via the dimensional regularization of the chiral perturbation theory amplitudes [5]. One can explicitly validate this approach [20]: the coefficients that have been evaluated to  $\mathcal{O}(N_c)$  in either version of the NJL model are finite in the chiral limit, and acquire chiral logarithms (at the scale  $\mu = 2m \approx m_\sigma$  of the  $\sigma$  meson mass) upon incorporating the meson loops.

The results obtained in this manner are in reasonable agreement with the known empirical values of the  $\bar{l}$ 's, after including the logarithm as shown. As already noted, this agreement, however, depends explicitly on the calculated value of the dynamically generated quark mass

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that the good agreement claimed in previous calculations can be traced back to the fact that the chiral logarithm is a slowly varying function.

as obtained from the gap equation. An important exception to this remark is the result for the electric polarizability,  $\alpha_E$ , of charged pions. This coefficient can be obtained directly from Holstein's sum rule [22] in conjunction with the ENJL expressions for the spectral densities and the pion radius. One obtains the simple form

$$\alpha_E = \frac{\alpha}{m_\pi} \frac{1}{48\pi^2 f_\pi^2} (\bar{l}_6^{ENJL} - \bar{l}_5^{ENJL}) = \frac{g_A^2}{8\pi^2 f_\pi^2} \frac{\alpha}{m_\pi} \leq \frac{1}{8\pi^2 f_\pi^2} \frac{\alpha}{m_\pi} = 6.05 \times 10^{-4} \text{ fm}^3 \quad (1.4)$$

where  $\alpha = e^2/4\pi \approx 1/137$ , and the other symbols have their usual meanings. This is an extremely interesting result for several reasons. Firstly it coincides exactly in form with the CHPT expression for the polarizability in terms of the  $\bar{l}_i$  to one-loop order [23]. Secondly, the terms coming from the dynamically generated quark mass  $m$  cancel exactly in the difference  $\bar{l}_6^{ENJL} - \bar{l}_5^{ENJL}$ , leading to a result that *only contains physical constants*. Thirdly, only the axial meson degree of freedom contributes to the polarizability through  $g_A$ ; there is no contribution from the  $\rho$  meson. Fourthly, since  $g_A^2 \leq 1$ , this establishes a *parameter free* prediction for the upper limit on the ENJL value of  $\alpha_E$ , at least to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha N_c)$ . Using the estimated value  $g_A = 0.75$ , one has the numerical result,  $\alpha_E = 3.40 \times 10^{-4} \text{ fm}^3$ . This answer can be compared directly with the prediction [22] of chiral perturbation theory to one-loop order,  $\alpha_E^{chpt} = 2.68 \times 10^{-4} \text{ fm}^3$ , that uses the empirical values of the  $\bar{l}$ 's. Experimentally, the value of  $\alpha_E$  is still very uncertain. Current analysis of the available data gives values of  $\alpha_E$  ranging between  $2.2 \pm 1.6$  to  $20 \pm 12 \times 10^{-4} \text{ fm}^3$  [24–28].

One can also evaluate the current algebra result of Das *et al.* [29] for the electromagnetic splitting of the charged to neutral pion masses using the ENJL spectral densities. The Das *et al.* formula links the splitting  $\Delta m_\pi^2 = m_{\pi^\pm}^2 - m_{\pi^0}^2$  to a modified sum rule for the spectral density difference  $\rho_1^V - \rho_1^A$ , integrated over all momentum transfers of the virtual photons that are responsible for the electromagnetic self-energy of the pion. The resulting ENJL expression for this mass squared difference can be written in the compact form [17]

$$\Delta m_\pi^2 = 3ie^2 \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{q^2} F_P(q^2) F_V(q^2) F_A(q^2) \quad (1.5)$$

where the  $F$ 's are pion and quark form factors that are defined in Section II of the main text. The special assumption that the form factors in Eq. (1.5) describe point-like mesons without internal structure, leads to the result originally derived by Das *et al.*. Further evaluation of this expression is postponed to Section IV. There we also give the set of gauge invariant pion polarization diagrams to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha N_c)$  that corresponds to this result. The electromagnetic gauge invariance of the mass difference expression is thereby made explicit.

As has been alluded to in an earlier part of the introduction, the determination and interpretation of the vector and axial vector excitation modes that are supported by the

ENJL model is not straightforward, but remain essential ingredients for the construction of the spectral densities. We have therefore investigated these modes anew. The particular innate difficulty in these calculations arises from the fact that both the  $\rho$  meson and the axial vector meson  $a_1$  have empirical masses that lie *above* the  $4m^2$  threshold for free quark pair creation, a non-physical process from the point of view of confinement. The existence of this threshold means that the complex plane for the momentum transfer variable squared  $s$  has a unitarity cut along  $4m^2 \leq s \leq \infty$ . Accordingly the ENJL model masses have to be sought as the poles of the relevant meson propagators that have been continued through this cut onto the contiguous or “second” Riemann sheet.

Taken at face value, these facts seem to make a model of this nature of dubious value for the vector modes. In fact, the situation is far more complicated than this. A careful analysis of the vector polarization shows that this function has *two* isolated poles on the second sheet for our parameter choice: one on the real axis below  $4m^2$ , and a second complex pole in the lower half plane of that sheet. The real pole corresponds to a  $\rho$  mode containing *virtually* bound  $\bar{q}q$  pairs<sup>2</sup>. The  $\rho$  spectral density function receives contributions from both of these poles. A single pole approximation to describe the resonance behavior of the vector strength in terms of a single mass plus a width parameter is thus incomplete. While this density still displays a single-peak structure that can be placed around the observed physical  $\rho$  mass for an appropriate choice of parameters, the extent to which the virtual state strength intrudes<sup>3</sup> into the energy domain of the peak is parameter-dependent. Thus one cannot unambiguously associate the position of the peak with the mass squared of the  $\rho$  meson as being given by either the virtual bound state pole, or the real part of the complex pole. We give full details of this problem in Section III. As such, the interpretation of the  $\rho$  meson, like the  $\pi$  meson, differs vastly from the conventional view of being simply a bound state of two constituents. Note in passing that, simply taken on its own, the  $\rho$  meson is of considerable interest currently, given its special role in the interpretations of the observed excess in the

---

<sup>2</sup>The occurrence of this state in the ENJL model was first pointed out in [30]. Increasing the coupling strength  $G_2$  of the vector plus axial vector terms in the Lagrangian causes this mode to move through the branch cut onto the physical sheet, to become a true bound state for the model  $\rho$  meson.

<sup>3</sup>The enhancement of the neutron-proton scattering cross-section in the singlet channel over that in the triplet channel due to the presence of a virtually bound singlet state in the former, is a case in point [31].

lepton spectra in heavy-ion collisions in the intermediate mass range [32].

By contrast, the axial vector polarization displays a single complex pole in the lower half plane of the second sheet, and the axial vector spectral density has a single peak structure that can be associated with this pole. The positions of peaks in both the vector and the axial vector spectral functions are basically controlled by the vector coupling strength  $G_2$ . While the value of this coupling can be fixed via  $g_A$  at  $G_2 = (1 - g_A)/(8f_\pi^2) \approx 3.61\text{GeV}^{-2}$  [from Eq. (2.85)], plus the known value of  $f_\pi \approx 93\text{MeV}$  and an assumed value for  $g_A = 0.75$ , the actual peak positions are fairly robust against moderate changes in  $G_2$ . Taking the resulting peaks to define the  $\rho(770)$  and  $a_1(1260)$  meson masses, one obtains  $m_\rho = 713\text{MeV}$ ,  $m_{a_1} = 1027\text{MeV}$  for the vector masses of the ENJL model, to be compared with the observed masses of  $768.1 \pm 0.6\text{MeV}$  and  $1230 \pm 40\text{MeV}$  [33]. It is interesting to observe that the predicted ratio  $m_{a_1}/m_\rho = 1.44 \approx \sqrt{2}$  for the above value of  $G_2$  is remarkably close to the original Weinberg estimate [2] of exactly  $\sqrt{2}$ .

The values for the model masses are satisfactory from an experimental point of view. One thus has to try to reconcile these results with the fact that neither spectral function contains its dominant physical decay channel,  $\rho \rightarrow \pi\pi$  or  $a_1 \rightarrow \rho\pi$  respectively, but rather describes the (hypothetical)  $\rho \rightarrow \bar{q}q$  or  $a_1 \rightarrow \bar{q}q$  decays allowed by the non-confining ENJL Lagrangian. This is a long-recognised deficiency [8]. On the other hand, the model spectral densities continue to saturate the first sum rule, Eq. (1.1). From these facts alone, one can argue with some justification that the positions of the peaks in these distributions are more significant than the particular manner in which they decay, and therefore do lead to meaningful masses. One should recall in this regard that, in Weinberg's original discussion of the problem, the vector meson mass ratio was determined by using delta function distributions for the vector densities that ignored all decay channels, but with strengths that allowed the sum rules to be satisfied. More generally, the fact that both Weinberg's and Gasser and Leutwyler's sum rules are satisfied by the model spectral density functions in spite of their undesirable decay properties, suggests that results based on integrals over these densities do nevertheless have physical significance.

An analysis of the ENJL model commences with the construction of the irreducible polarizations that are now coupled in the isovector pseudoscalar and longitudinal axial channels. This is done in Section II. We are not the first authors to carry out such an analysis (see e.g. [8,13]). Hence this section is in the nature of a summary of those aspects of the problem that are necessary for an understanding of the sum rules, and it also serves to set our notation. From a knowledge of the irreducible polarization functions, the new meson propagators in the extended model can be constructed. This is done in such a fashion that the generaliza-

tion from the NJL model becomes obvious, and so that the NJL results are simply recovered on setting  $G_2$  to zero. Central to the derivations is that, as far as possible, quantities are expressed in terms of physical variables, the pion decay constants  $f_\pi$  and the pion quark coupling strength,  $g_{\pi qq}$ , in the ENJL model. One observes that these quantities undergo a simple multiplicative scaling  $f_\pi = \sqrt{g_A} f_p$  and  $g_{\pi qq} = g_p / \sqrt{g_A}$  via the quark axial form factor  $g_A$  with respect to their NJL values  $f_p$  and  $g_p$  in such a way as to preserve the chiral theorems, like the Goldberger-Treiman relation. In fact, apart from such scaling, the main effect of including the vector and axial vector degrees of freedom is to drastically redistribute the associated NJL spectral densities into two peaks that serve to determine the masses of these modes in the model. Conservation of the axial vector current can also be demonstrated explicitly. Here one finds that the ENJL model leads to non-trivial vector and axial form factors  $F_V(q^2)$  and  $G_A(q^2)$  for the quark currents such that  $F_V(0) = 1$ , but  $G_A(0) = g_A \leq 1$ .

There is of course an overriding *caveat* on all of these statements: the issue of regularization. In addition to being non-confining, the NJL model and its ENJL extension are both non-renormalizable. Thus a cutoff  $\Lambda$  in their mass spectra is necessary in order to obtain finite answers. One anticipates that the magnitude of this cutoff will be similar for either version of the model, but this parameter has in any event to be of order of the chiral symmetry-breaking scale  $\Lambda_\chi \sim 1\text{GeV}$  of QCD. Otherwise the NJL Lagrangian could not reasonably fulfill the role of a low energy effective model theory. However the problem is more complicated than this. One has to also ensure that the regularization scheme employed respects the chiral Ward identities satisfied by those amplitudes that express the consequences of the chiral symmetry of this model Lagrangian. The Pauli-Villars regularization scheme [18] fulfills these requirements [15,16]: in particular, it preserves those chiral Ward identities between regulated amplitudes that are necessary for a demonstration of the sum rules<sup>4</sup>. We take up the PV regularization of the polarization amplitudes in some detail in Appendix A. There we show that the PV scheme can be implemented in conjunction with either unsubtracted, or once-subtracted dispersion relations that lead, not surprisingly, to a very different asymptotic behavior of the polarization amplitude in question. This feature has a direct bearing on the ability of the associated spectral density, which is given by the imaginary part of the polarization, to satisfy the sum rules.

---

<sup>4</sup>This is not to say that the Pauli-Villars regularization scheme will guarantee all Ward identities. A discussion of the related questions that arise in the case of the PV regularization of the  $\sigma$ -model, for example, can be found in [34].



The spectral density functions carrying specific quantum numbers are next introduced in Section III with the aid of the appropriate current-current correlators and the Källén-Lehman spectral representation. We establish the analytic properties of the polarization functions. Then we analyse the analytic behavior of their corresponding spectral density functions under PV-regularization, and show by means of contour integration techniques that all eight sum rules, the two of Weinberg, and the six of Gasser and Leutwyler, are obeyed by ENJL spectral densities regulated in this manner. The only exceptions that occur are for the zero-moment sum rules, like in Eq. (1.2), where a finite value instead of zero appears on the right hand side. We use these results in conjunction with the non-chiral expansions for the physical pion mass and decay constant of Section II to identify several of the coupling parameters of chiral perturbation theory. In parallel with these developments, we also explore the analytic properties of polarization amplitudes that have been obtained from once-subtracted dispersion relations prior to regularization. Such amplitudes are shown to give rise to Landau ghost poles at space-like  $q^2$  in the  $\pi$ ,  $\rho$ , and  $a_1$  channels. Some of the consequences of nevertheless admitting such unphysical propagators are briefly discussed.

In Section IV, we discuss the use of ENJL spectral densities in conjunction with sum rules to compute two electromagnetic properties of the pion: the electric polarizability coefficient of the charged pion from Holstein's sum rule [22], and the  $\pi^\pm - \pi^0$  mass splitting from the current algebra sum rule of Das, Guralnik, Mathur, Low and Young [29]. We also provide an alternative derivation of the mass splitting in terms of Feynman diagrams that leads to exactly the same result. An explicit demonstration of how Dashen's theorem is satisfied by the ENJL model electromagnetic self-energies for the neutral pion is also given. A summary of results and conclusions is presented in Section V, while Appendix A contains additional calculational details of a more technical nature that do not appear in the main text.

## II. REVIEW OF FORMALISM

Since the properties of Nambu-Jona-Lasinio type Lagrangians have already been the subject of extensive analysis in the recent literature [7–13], we use this section to briefly summarize only those aspects that will be required as background for the specific developments to follow in Sections III and IV.

## A. Two-point functions

In this section, we discuss the two-point correlation functions from which the spectral densities we wish to study are obtained. Since the calculational procedure is the same for all spectral densities, let us denote by  $J^a(x)$  a generic operator with  $SU(2)$  isospin and Lorentz indices summarized by the index  $a$ . Then the associated time-ordered two-point correlators, or polarization functions, are given by

$$\int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle 0 | T \{ J^a(x) J^b(0) \} | 0 \rangle \quad (2.1)$$

in momentum space, where  $T$  is the usual time-ordering operator. These currents are assumed to be bilinear forms of the two-flavor quark fields  $\psi(x)$  and their Dirac adjoints, i.e.

$$J^a(x) = \bar{\psi}(x) \Gamma^a \psi(x), \quad (2.2)$$

where the vertex  $\Gamma^a$  characterizes the nature of the excitation. Using the notation of Ref. [5], the bilinear forms  $P, S, V, A$  for isospin currents  $J^a$  are

$$\begin{aligned} P^a(x) &= \bar{\psi}(x) i \gamma_5 \tau^a \psi(x) & 0^{-+} & \pi \\ S^a(x) &= \bar{\psi}(x) \tau^a \psi(x) & 0^{++} & a_0 \\ V_\mu^a(x) &= \bar{\psi}(x) \gamma_\mu \frac{\tau^a}{2} \psi(x) & 1^{--} & \rho \\ A_\mu^a(x) &= \bar{\psi}(x) \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \frac{\tau^a}{2} \psi(x) & 1^{++} & a_1 \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

with  $\tau^a$ ,  $a = 1, 2, 3$  being the  $SU(2)$  Pauli isospin matrices. The spin, parity and charge conjugation quantum numbers  $J^{PC}$  of the excitations they lead to relative to the invariant vacuum, as well as representative low-lying meson states that carry these quantum numbers, are also indicated. In addition to these isospin currents, it is useful to consider the isoscalar densities

$$\begin{aligned} P^0(x) &= \bar{\psi}(x) i \gamma_5 \psi(x) & 0^{-+} & \eta \\ S^0(x) &= \bar{\psi}(x) \psi(x) & 0^{++} & f_0 \text{ or } \sigma \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

The factor of  $1/2$  that is included in Eq. (2.3) in the definition of the vector and axial vector currents is purely convention. If we further assume that the dynamics of these quark currents are governed by a two-flavor  $U(1) \times SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2)$  chirally symmetric Lagrangian of the Nambu-Jona-Lasinio type, then both the vector and the axial vector (Noether) currents will be conserved. If this is the case, then the Lorentz and isospin structure of the expression (2.1) is known ahead of time. If we write

$$\int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle 0 | T \{ J_\mu^a(x) J_\nu^b(0) \} | 0 \rangle = -\frac{i}{4} \tilde{\Pi}_{\mu\nu;ab}^{JJ}(q^2), \quad (2.5)$$

where  $J_\mu^a(x)$  is given by either  $V_\mu^a$  or  $A_\mu^a$ , then both correlation functions become purely transverse tensors in their Lorentz indices and diagonal in their isospin indices, i.e.

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{\mu\nu;ab}^{JJ}(q^2) = \tilde{\Pi}^{JJ}(q^2) T_{\mu\nu} \delta_{ab}, \quad (2.6)$$

where  $T_{\mu\nu} = (g_{\mu\nu} - \hat{q}_\mu \hat{q}_\nu)$  with  $\hat{q}_\mu = q_\mu / \sqrt{q^2}$ . In a similar fashion, the scalar and pseudoscalar two-point functions have the structure

$$\int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle 0 | T \{ J^a(x) J^b(0) \} | 0 \rangle = -i \tilde{\Pi}^{JJ}(q^2) \delta_{ab}, \quad (2.7)$$

where  $J^a(x)$  is given by either  $S^a$  or  $P^a$  for the isovector currents, or by  $S^0$  or  $P^0$  for the isoscalar densities. In the latter case, there is no isospin factor. Note that in Eqs. (2.5) to (2.7), we have introduced the full polarization functions  $\tilde{\Pi}^{JJ}(q^2)$ . In order to achieve a uniformity of definition for these, we have introduced a factor 1/4 in Eq. (2.5) to compensate for the factor 1/2 carried in Eq. (2.3) in the current definition.

It is important to bear in mind that the transverse form given by Eq. (2.6) holds in the first place for the exact vector or axial vector polarization in a chirally symmetric theory, and therefore must also hold for any approximate calculation of either function. Therefore any approximate treatment has to be implemented in such a manner that current conservation is maintained at each level of approximation: otherwise the physical consequences of the symmetries contained in the Lagrangian could become distorted. A case in point that is discussed again below is the mixing of the *longitudinal* axial vector and pseudoscalar pion modes already at the lowest order of approximation in the minimal NJL model that is necessary to ensure axial current conservation in the chiral limit [21].

## B. Effective chiral Lagrangian

In order to calculate the two-point correlation functions, we need to specify the Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}$  governing their dynamics. For this purpose, we identify  $\mathcal{L}$  with the two-flavor Nambu-Jona-Lasinio Lagrangian, that has been extended to include vector and axial degrees of freedom in a chirally invariant fashion [8,12,13]. We write

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ENJL}} = \bar{\psi} [i \not{\partial} - \hat{m}] \psi + G_1 [(\bar{\psi} \psi)^2 + (\bar{\psi} i \gamma_5 \boldsymbol{\tau} \psi)^2] - G_2 [(\bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu \boldsymbol{\tau} \psi)^2 + (\bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \boldsymbol{\tau} \psi)^2] \quad (2.8)$$

where the isovector and axial vector terms have to appear with a common coupling constant  $G_2$  in order to retain chiral invariance<sup>5</sup>. In this expression, the  $\psi'$ s are iso-doublet, color-triplet Dirac quark fields and  $\hat{m}$  is the averaged current quark mass  $\hat{m} = (m_u^0 + m_d^0)/2$ . We also note that  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ENJL}}$  breaks the  $U_A(1)$  symmetry in maximal fashion due to the 't Hooft term [35] that it contains [10] and which models the QCD instanton interaction. The  $G'$ s should be assumed to scale like  $N_C^{-1}$  if the correct QCD scaling properties for the quark and meson masses are to be maintained.

In the following, it will be convenient to refer to results that are obtained with  $G_2$  either present or absent as pertaining to the ENJL or NJL model respectively. Then, apart from the pionic and sigma-like excitations with  $J^{PC} = 0^{-+}$  and  $0^{++}$  that are collective modes of the NJL Lagrangian built out of coherent superpositions of strongly interacting  $\bar{q}q$  pairs of binding energy  $2m$  and zero respectively [7], the ENJL Lagrangian also supports additional collective modes with  $J^{PC} = 1^{--}$  and  $1^{++}$  that coincide with the quantum numbers of the  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  meson. Although we will continue to refer to these modes as “meson” states of the corresponding name for brevity, to what extent this identification with the actual physical mesons of the same quantum numbers is appropriate, is a matter for later discussion.

### C. Schwinger-Dyson amplitudes to leading order $\mathcal{O}(N_c)$ via diagram summation: the RPA approximation

Due to the specific structure of the Lagrangian in Eq. (2.8), the Schwinger-Dyson [SD] integral equations for the full polarization functions can be solved explicitly [7] in terms of the lowest order single quark loop irreducible polarization diagrams. These individual loops are denoted as  $\Pi^{JJ'}$  together with the appropriate additional spinor and flavor structure. They may be decomposed according to their Lorentz structure as

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu;ab}^{VV}(q^2) = \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2)T_{\mu\nu}\delta_{ab} \quad (2.9a)$$

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu;ab}^{AA}(q^2) = [\Pi_T^{AA}(q^2)T_{\mu\nu} + \Pi_L^{AA}(q^2)L_{\mu\nu}]\delta_{ab} \quad (2.9b)$$

---

<sup>5</sup>One could equally well include additional chirally invariant terms in this Lagrangian, like the separately chirally invariant isoscalar vector and the axial vector terms (carrying the quantum numbers of the  $\omega$  and  $f_1$  mesons). However, since the important collective low-lying excitations contained in  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NJL}}$  are the pions which are also isovector, the isovector vector mesons are the relevant degrees of freedom for our purposes.

$$\Pi_{\mu;ab}^{AP}(q^2) = \Pi^{AP}(q^2)\hat{q}_\mu\delta_{ab}, \quad \hat{q}_\mu = \frac{q_\mu}{\sqrt{q^2}} \quad (2.9c)$$

$$\Pi_{ab}^{PP}(q^2) = \Pi^{PP}(q^2)\delta_{ab} \quad (2.9d)$$

$$\Pi_{ab}^{SS}(q^2) = \Pi^{SS}(q^2)\delta_{ab}. \quad (2.9e)$$

The two remaining polarizations  $\Pi^{P_0P_0}(q^2)$  and  $\Pi^{S_0S_0}(q^2)$  generated by the density operators  $P^0$  and  $S^0$  are scalars in both Lorentz and isospin space. Here  $L_{\mu\nu} = \hat{q}_\mu\hat{q}_\nu$  is a longitudinal tensor such that  $T_{\mu\nu} + L_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu}$ . As has been indicated explicitly, the irreducible polarizations are all functions of  $q^2$ . The full polarization functions that were introduced in Eqs. (2.5) to (2.7) and are denoted by  $\tilde{\Pi}^{JJ'}$  have the same invariant structure as the irreducible one-loop amplitudes that generate them. Note that the vertices that these one-loop diagrams connect are indicated by the following superscripts,

$$V \rightarrow \gamma_\mu\tau_a, \quad A \rightarrow \gamma_\mu\gamma_5\tau_a, \quad P \rightarrow i\gamma_5\tau_a, \quad S \rightarrow \tau_a, \quad P_0 \rightarrow i\gamma_5, \quad S_0 \rightarrow 1. \quad (2.10)$$

All such one-loop diagrams involve traces over all quark variables, which make them proportional to  $N_c$ . Thus their products with  $G_1$  or  $G_2$  are independent of  $N_c$ . Hence the RPA approximation for the polarization amplitudes, which involves a selective summation of diagrams to all orders in the (strong) interaction parameters  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , will only contain interaction effects to leading order  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  in the expansion in powers of the inverse color variable  $1/N_c$  if, as here, we replace the exact irreducible polarization by its one-loop approximation.

We can now write down separate SD integral equations for the pure vector ( $\rho$ ), pure transverse axial vector, and coupled longitudinal axial vector-pseudoscalar ( $a_L, \pi$ ) channels. We can do this for either the scattering amplitudes in these channels or the polarization diagrams. If we do the latter, then one sees from the structure of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NJL}}$  that the full vector polarization is simply given by the geometric progression of one-loop irreducible amplitudes connected via the interaction in this channel,

$$\tilde{\Pi}_T^{VV} = \Pi_T^{VV} - 2G_2\Pi_T^{VV}\tilde{\Pi}_T^{VV} = \frac{\Pi_T^{VV}}{1 + 2G_2\Pi_T^{VV}}, \quad (2.11)$$

and is automatically transverse and strictly  $\mathcal{O}(N_c)$  since the denominator is  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  in the number of colors. We refer to this in the following as the random phase approximation, or RPA because of its similarity with the diagram summation technique used in discussing collective modes in nuclear physics. The axial vector and pseudoscalar polarization functions are by contrast coupled by the amplitude  $\Pi_{\mu;ab}^{AP}$  that allows for transitions between the longitudinal part of the axial vector and the pseudoscalar pion modes. This feature was

first observed in the early field theoretic formulations of Weinberg's model [36] where it led to a finite pion field renormalization. The situation here is very similar although there are no elementary meson fields present in the Lagrangian. Taking this off-diagonal polarization amplitude into account, one has

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{\mu\nu}^{AA} = \Pi_{\mu\nu}^{AA} + \Pi_{\mu\rho}^{AA}(-2G_2)g^{\rho\rho'}\tilde{\Pi}_{\rho'\nu}^{AA} + \Pi_{\mu}^{AP}(2G_1)\tilde{\Pi}_{\nu}^{PA}, \quad (2.12)$$

after dropping the now redundant isospin labels. Note that  $\Pi_{\mu}^{AP}\tilde{\Pi}_{\nu}^{PA} = \Pi^{AP}\tilde{\Pi}^{PA}\hat{q}_{\mu}\hat{q}_{\nu}$  is longitudinal. Hence one can split the solution of the above equation into parts that are purely transverse, and parts that are purely longitudinal:

$$\tilde{\Pi}_T^{AA} = \Pi_T^{AA} - 2G_2\Pi_T^{AA}\tilde{\Pi}_T^{AA} = \frac{\Pi_T^{AA}}{1 + 2G_2\Pi_T^{AA}} \quad (2.13)$$

and

$$\tilde{\Pi}_L^{AA} = \Pi_L^{AA} - 2G_2\Pi_L^{AA}\tilde{\Pi}_L^{AA} + 2G_1\Pi^{AP}\tilde{\Pi}^{PA}. \quad (2.14)$$

The pseudoscalar polarization function can likewise be found as the solution of the pair of coupled SD equations,

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{PP} = \Pi^{PP} + \Pi^{PP}(2G_1)\tilde{\Pi}^{PP} + \Pi^{PA}(-2G_2)\tilde{\Pi}^{AP}, \quad (2.15)$$

while

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{PA}\hat{q}_{\mu} = \Pi^{PA}\hat{q}_{\mu} + \Pi^{PA}\hat{q}^{\nu}(-2G_2)\tilde{\Pi}_{\nu\mu}^{AA} + \Pi^{PP}(2G_1)\tilde{\Pi}^{PA}\hat{q}_{\mu}$$

or

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{PA} = \Pi^{PA} + \Pi^{PA}(-2G_2)\tilde{\Pi}^{AA} + \Pi^{PP}(2G_1)\tilde{\Pi}^{PA}, \quad (2.16)$$

since  $\Pi^{PA;\nu}\tilde{\Pi}_{\nu\mu}^{AA} = \Pi^{PA}\tilde{\Pi}_L^{AA}\hat{q}_{\mu}$  projects out onto the longitudinal part of the axial polarization. Thus we end up with a single equation for the transverse axial polarization, but three coupled equations (2.14-2.16) for the pseudoscalar polarization and the longitudinal part of the axial polarization. These latter equations can be written as a single matrix equation in the  $P, A$  space as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{\Pi}} = \mathbf{\Pi} + \mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{K}\tilde{\mathbf{\Pi}}, \quad (2.17)$$

where the boldface symbols have the matrix structure,

$$\mathbf{\Pi} = \begin{pmatrix} \Pi^{PP} & \Pi^{PA} \\ \Pi^{AP} & \Pi_L^{AA} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} 2G_1 & 0 \\ 0 & -2G_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.18)$$

The  $\tilde{\Pi}$  has the same matrix structure as  $\Pi$ . While the solution to this matrix equation may be found without difficulty [9], it is more instructive to proceed as follows. We split up the matrix of interaction strengths as

$$\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}_1 + \mathbf{K}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 2G_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2G_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.19)$$

and introduce the auxillary matrix of polarization functions  $\hat{\Pi}$ , distinguished by carrying a hat, that are generated by the *axial* vector part of the interaction acting in isolation. This auxillary matrix satisfies the equation

$$\hat{\Pi} = \Pi + \Pi \mathbf{K}_2 \hat{\Pi}, \quad (2.20)$$

with solution

$$\hat{\Pi} = (\mathbf{1} - \Pi \mathbf{K}_2)^{-1} \Pi. \quad (2.21)$$

Subtracting the matrix equations satisfied by  $\tilde{\Pi}$  and  $\hat{\Pi}$  respectively and using the solution for  $\hat{\Pi}$  given above, one finds that

$$\tilde{\Pi} = \hat{\Pi} + \hat{\Pi} \mathbf{K}_1 \tilde{\Pi}, \quad (2.22)$$

with solution

$$\tilde{\Pi} = (\mathbf{1} - \hat{\Pi} \mathbf{K}_1)^{-1} \hat{\Pi}. \quad (2.23)$$

This result shows that the role of the longitudinal axial mode can be completely absorbed in the determination of the auxillary polarization matrix  $\hat{\Pi}$ . The effect of this is to renormalize the one-loop polarization functions as follows, as may be seen by evaluating Eq. (2.21):

$$\hat{\Pi}^{PP} = \Pi^{PP} - 2G_2 \frac{\Pi^{PA} \Pi^{AP}}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_L^{AA}} \quad (2.24)$$

$$\hat{\Pi}^{AP} = \frac{\Pi^{AP}}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_L^{AA}} \quad (2.25)$$

$$\hat{\Pi}_L^{AA} = \frac{\Pi_L^{AA}}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_L^{AA}}, \quad (2.26)$$

where the argument  $q^2$  has been suppressed for brevity. Physically this renormalization comes about due to the partial summation to infinity of one-loop diagrams connected by the longitudinal piece of the axial vector interaction. Together with the explicit solution for the transverse axial polarization given by Eq. (2.13) above, Eqs. (2.21) and (2.23) provide us with

a complete description of the polarization matrix. It will turn out that the longitudinal part of  $\tilde{\Pi}_{\mu\nu}^{AA}$  vanishes *identically* in the presence of the pseudoscalar interaction term contained in  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NJL}}$  (in the chiral limit). This is not true of  $\hat{\Pi}_{\mu\nu}^{AA}$  that continues to have a longitudinal component.

Of the remaining polarization functions, only the isoscalar one,  $\Pi^{S_0 S_0}$  is modified by the interactions contained in  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NJL}}$ . Using the RPA again, one finds

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{S_0 S_0}(q^2) = \frac{\Pi^{S_0 S_0}(q^2)}{1 - 2G_1 \Pi^{S_0 S_0}(q^2)}. \quad (2.27)$$

All that is required now are the explicit forms of the matrix elements of the polarization at the one loop level to complete the solution for the various polarization functions. These are given below.

#### D. Calculation of the one-loop polarization functions

The one-loop diagrams corresponding to the isospin currents of Eq. (2.3) are given by

$$(2.28a)$$

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu;ab}^{VV} = i \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} Tr[\gamma_\mu \tau_a S(p+q) \gamma_\nu \tau_b S(p)] \quad (2.28b)$$

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu;ab}^{AA} = i \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} Tr[\gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \tau_a S(p+q) \gamma_\nu \gamma_5 \tau_b S(p)] \quad (2.28c)$$

$$\Pi_{\mu;ab}^{AP} = i \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} Tr[\gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \tau_a S(p+q) i \gamma_5 \tau_b S(p)] \quad (2.28d)$$

$$\Pi_{ab}^{PP} = i \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} Tr[i \gamma_5 \tau_a S(p+q) i \gamma_5 \tau_b S(p)] \quad (2.28e)$$

$$\Pi_{ab}^{SS} = i \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} Tr[\tau_a S(p+q) \tau_b S(p)], \quad (2.28f)$$

where the trace  $Tr$  operation runs over all intrinsic variables, and where  $S(p) = (\not{p} - m + i\epsilon)^{-1}$  is the quark propagator. The corresponding isoscalar diagrams are

$$\Pi^{P_0 P_0} = i \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} Tr[i \gamma_5 S(p+q) i \gamma_5 S(p)] \quad (2.29a)$$

$$\Pi^{S_0 S_0} = i \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} Tr[S(p+q) S(p)]. \quad (2.29b)$$

We first consider the chiral limit,  $\hat{m} = 0$ , and start with the scalar and pseudoscalar polarization diagrams, as well as the  $(\pi, a_L)$  coupled diagram. It has been shown [9–11] that all these diagrams may be written in terms of the mean field (or Hartree) expressions for the



pion weak decay constant  $f_p$ , the  $\pi qq$  coupling constant  $g_p$  and pion form factor  $F_P$  in the chiral limit. One has<sup>6</sup>

$$\Pi^{PP} = (2G_1)^{-1} + \frac{f_p^2(q^2)}{m^2} q^2 = \Pi^{P_0 P_0} \quad (2.30a)$$

$$\Pi^{AP} = 2i f_p^2(q^2) \sqrt{\frac{q^2}{m^2}} = (\Pi^{PA})^* \quad (2.30b)$$

$$\Pi^{S_0 S_0} = (2G_1)^{-1} + \frac{f_p^2(q^2)}{m^2} (q^2 - 4m^2) = \Pi^{SS}, \quad (2.30c)$$

after introducing the abbreviation

$$f_p^2(q^2) = f_p^2 F_P(q^2). \quad (2.31)$$

Here

$$f_p^2 = -4i N_c m^2 I(0) \quad (2.32a)$$

$$g_p^2 = [-4i N_c I(0)]^{-1} \quad (2.32b)$$

$$F_P(q^2) = I(q^2)/I(0), \quad (2.32c)$$

where  $I(q^2)$  is the common loop integral

$$I(q^2) = \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{[(p+q)^2 - m^2][p^2 - m^2]}. \quad (2.33)$$

A suitable regularization of this divergent integral is discussed in Appendix A. Notice that the mean field pion decay constant and pion-quark coupling satisfy the Goldberger-Treiman relation  $f_p g_p = m$  at the quark level, where the quark mass  $m$  arises from spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking in the groundstate of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NJL}}$ . This mass is self-consistently determined by the single quark self-energy  $\Sigma$  as  $m = \Sigma(m)$ , the so-called “gap” equation [7]. In the Hartree mean-field approximation, one finds for either the NJL model or its ENJL extension that

$$\begin{aligned} m \approx \Sigma_H &= 2G_1 \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \text{Tr}[iS(p)] \\ &= 16G_1 N_c m \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{i}{p^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

---

<sup>6</sup>The expressions for the scalar and pseudoscalar amplitudes also contain surface terms [37] that arise because of the momentum variable shifts that have to be introduced to simplify them using the quadratically divergent gap equation. The surface terms are removed after Pauli-Villars regularization as discussed in more detail in Ref. [15].

since only the scalar interaction in  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NJL}}$  is operative in determining  $\Sigma_H$ . This equation leads to the relations  $\Pi^{PP}(0) = \Pi^{S_0 S_0}(4m^2) = (2G_1)^{-1}$  that have been used to simplify  $\Pi^{PP}$  and  $\Pi^{S_0 S_0}$  in Eqs. (2.30a) and (2.30c).

We now turn to the vector and axial vector polarization diagrams of Eqs. (2.28b) and (2.28c). Commuting  $\gamma_5 S(p) = S(-p)\gamma_5$  under the trace in the latter expression leads to

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu;ab}^{AA}(q^2) - \Pi_{\mu\nu;ab}^{VV}(q^2) = 4f_p^2 F_P(q^2) g_{\mu\nu} \delta_{ab}. \quad (2.35)$$

One also notes that  $\Pi_{\mu\nu;ab}^{VV}$  is purely transverse, as may be established by contracting with  $q^\mu$  and using the identity  $q' = S^{-1}(p+q) - S^{-1}(p)$ . Then

$$q^\mu \Pi_{\mu\nu;ab}^{VV} = i \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \text{Tr} [S(p)\gamma_\nu - S(p+q)\gamma_\nu] \delta_{ab} = 0, \quad (2.36)$$

*provided* that the necessary shift in the momentum integration variable in the divergent integral on the right is allowed. If so, one can conclude that

$$\Pi_T^{AA}(q^2) - \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2) = \Pi_L^{AA}(q^2) = 4f_p^2(q^2), \quad (2.37)$$

by inserting the axial and vector polarizations in terms of their transverse and longitudinal parts from Eqs. (2.9b) and (2.9a), projecting out with the help of the relations  $T^{\mu\nu}T_{\mu\nu} = T^{\mu\nu}g_{\mu\nu} = 3$  and  $L^{\mu\nu}L_{\mu\nu} = 1$ , and using Eq. (2.31).

The relations (2.37), which are in the nature of Ward identities, are crucial for proving the Weinberg sum rules [2] as well as establishing the relation between the Feynman diagram structure and the Das *et al.* [29] formulation for the electromagnetic pion mass splitting in the ENJL model. Since all these quantities involve formally divergent integrals at the one-loop level, their regularization has to be implemented in such a fashion that Eqs. (2.35), (2.36) and Eq. (2.37) on which these relations are based, remain valid between the regulated quantities as well. We discuss this later. The explicit form of  $\Pi_T^{VV}(q^2)$  after regularization is given in the appendix. It is shown there that  $\Pi_T^{VV}(0) = 0$ . Thus one sees from Eq. (2.37) that

$$\Pi_T^{AA}(0) = \Pi_L^{AA}(0) = 4f_p^2. \quad (2.38)$$

The ingredients needed for constructing the polarization matrix  $\mathbf{\Pi}$  are now available: the pseudoscalar and mixed polarization diagrams appear in Eqs. (2.30a, 2.30b), and  $\Pi_L^{AA}$  is already known from Eq. (2.37). The resulting one-loop polarization in  $(P, A)$  space is given by the hermitian matrix

$$\mathbf{\Pi} = \begin{pmatrix} (2G_1)^{-1} + f_p^2(q^2) \frac{q^2}{m^2} & -2if_p^2(q^2) \sqrt{\frac{q^2}{m^2}} \\ 2if_p^2(q^2) \sqrt{\frac{q^2}{m^2}} & 4f_p^2(q^2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.39)$$

After renormalization by the longitudinal axial mode according to Eq. (2.21), this becomes

$$\hat{\Pi} = \begin{pmatrix} (2G_1)^{-1} + f_\pi^2(q^2)\frac{q^2}{m^2} & -2if_\pi^2(q^2)\sqrt{\frac{q^2}{m^2}} \\ 2if_\pi^2(q^2)\sqrt{\frac{q^2}{m^2}} & 4f_\pi^2(q^2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.40)$$

Notice that the *sole* effect of the longitudinal mode is to replace the factor  $f_p(q^2)$  of Eq. (2.31) by

$$f_\pi(q^2) = f_p(q^2)[1 + 8G_2f_p^2(q^2)]^{-\frac{1}{2}}; \quad f_p^2(q^2) = f_p^2F_P(q^2). \quad (2.41)$$

It is shown later [Eq. (2.79)] that the chiral limit  $q^2 \rightarrow 0$  of this expression gives the pion weak decay constant  $f_\pi$  for the ENJL model. Since

$$(\mathbf{1} - \hat{\Pi}\mathbf{K}_1)^{-1} = \mathcal{D}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 4iG_1f_\pi^2(q^2)\sqrt{\frac{q^2}{m^2}} & \mathcal{D} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.42)$$

where the determinant  $\mathcal{D}$  is

$$\mathcal{D} = \text{Det}(\mathbf{1} - \hat{\Pi}\mathbf{K}_1) = 1 - 2G_1\hat{\Pi}^{PP}(q^2), \quad (2.43)$$

the matrix elements of  $\tilde{\Pi} = (\mathbf{1} - \hat{\Pi}\mathbf{K}_1)^{-1}\hat{\Pi}$  now follow as

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{PP} = \frac{\hat{\Pi}^{PP}(q^2)}{1 - 2G_1\hat{\Pi}^{PP}(q^2)} \quad (2.44)$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{AP} = \frac{2if_\pi^2(q^2)\sqrt{\frac{q^2}{m^2}}}{1 - 2G_1\hat{\Pi}^{PP}(q^2)} = -\frac{i}{G_1}\sqrt{\frac{m^2}{q^2}} \quad (2.45)$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{PA} = (\tilde{\Pi}^{AP})^* \quad (2.46)$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}_L^{AA} = 0, \quad (2.47)$$

where

$$\hat{\Pi}^{PP}(q^2) = (2G_1)^{-1} + \frac{f_\pi^2(q^2)}{m^2}q^2 \quad (2.48)$$

is the renormalized version of the pseudoscalar polarization of (2.30a). Thus  $\tilde{\Pi}$  has a zero in the lower right hand corner: the full longitudinal polarization *vanishes* as it must, to ensure axial current conservation when the longitudinal axial vector ( $a_L$ ) mode mixing with  $\pi$  is properly taken into account. Note that this conclusion also remains true for the minimal NJL model, where  $G_2 = 0$  [21].

## E. Propagators

Together with Eqs. (2.11), (2.13) and (2.27), the above suite of equations completes the solutions for the transverse vector and axial vector, scalar, and the coupled pseudoscalar-longitudinal axial vector polarization functions for the ENJL model in the RPA approximation. We now turn to the task of constructing the associated propagators for these various modes.

### 1. The $\rho$ and transverse $a_1$ mode propagators

The scattering amplitude of a quark-antiquark pair arising from the exchange of either vector meson mode has the form

$$(\Gamma_J^{\mu;a})_{12} \left[ \frac{1}{i} D_{\mu\nu,ab}^{JJ}(q^2) \right] (\Gamma_J^{\nu;b})_{34}, \quad (2.49)$$

where

$$\Gamma_J^{\mu;a} = \gamma^\mu \tau^a \quad \text{or} \quad \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \tau^a, \quad (2.50)$$

for the vector or axial vector channels respectively. The  $D_{\mu\nu,ab}^{JJ} = D_{\mu\nu}^{JJ} \delta_{ab}$  defines the corresponding meson propagator. In the RPA approximation, it is built up from the interaction lines  $-2iG_2$  and  $2iG_1$  that connect 0, 1, 2,... polarization bubbles to the initial and final vertices. In the vector channel, the sequence of contributions for  $-iD_{\mu\nu}^{VV}$  reads

$$\begin{aligned} -iD_{\mu\nu}^{VV} &= (-2iG_2)g_{\mu\nu} + (-2iG_2) \left\{ \Pi_T^{VV} T_{\mu\nu} + (-2G_2)(\Pi_T^{VV})^2 T_{\mu\rho} T_\nu^\rho + \dots \right\} (-2iG_2) \\ &= \frac{(-2iG_2)}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{VV}} T_{\mu\nu} + (-2iG_2) L_{\mu\nu}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.51)$$

since the irreducible vector polarization is purely transverse. Hence the transverse and longitudinal parts of the rho propagator are

$$-iD_T^{VV} = \frac{(-2iG_2)}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{VV}}, \quad -iD_L^{VV} = (-2iG_2). \quad (2.52)$$

The corresponding expression for the axial vector propagator is complicated by the presence of the coupling amplitudes  $\Pi_\mu^{AP}$ . In place of Eq. (2.51), one has the series

$$\begin{aligned} -iD_{\mu\nu}^{AA} &= (-2iG_2)g_{\mu\nu} + (-2iG_2) \frac{1}{i} \left\{ \Pi_{\mu\nu}^{AA} + \Pi_{\mu\rho}^{AA} (-2G_2) g^{\rho\rho'} \Pi_{\rho'\nu}^{AA} + \dots \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Pi_\mu^{AP} (2G_1) \Pi_\nu^{PA} + \dots \right\} (-2iG_2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.53)$$

The series in the curly brackets is just the series for the full axial polarization  $\tilde{\Pi}_{\mu\nu}^{AA}$  given in Eq. (2.12). However, as this is again purely transverse, see Eq. (2.47), the results for the transverse and longitudinal parts of  $-iD_{\mu\nu}^{AA}$  are, according to Eq. (2.13), identical with those of  $-iD_{\mu\nu}^{VV}$  with  $\Pi_T^{VV}$  replaced by  $\Pi_T^{AA}$ . Thus

$$-iD_T^{AA} = \frac{(-2iG_2)}{1 + 2G_2\Pi_T^{AA}}, \quad -iD_L^{AA} = (-2iG_2). \quad (2.54)$$

The longitudinal part of this propagator also has non-vanishing off-diagonal elements, as we discuss below.

## 2. The coupled $\pi - a_L$ mode propagators

As we have seen, the pion and longitudinal axial modes  $\pi$  and  $a_L$  are coupled through the off-diagonal elements in  $\tilde{\Pi}$ . The corresponding SD equation for the resulting propagator is thus a matrix equation involving the full polarization matrix  $\tilde{\Pi}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} -i\mathbf{D} &= i\mathbf{K} + i\mathbf{K}\frac{1}{i}\mathbf{\Pi}i\mathbf{K} + i\mathbf{K}\frac{1}{i}\mathbf{\Pi}i\mathbf{K}\frac{1}{i}\mathbf{\Pi}i\mathbf{K} + \dots \\ &= i\mathbf{K} + i\mathbf{K}\frac{1}{i}\left\{\mathbf{\Pi} + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{\Pi} + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{\Pi} + \dots\right\}i\mathbf{K} \\ &= i\mathbf{K} + i\mathbf{K}\frac{1}{i}\tilde{\Pi}i\mathbf{K}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.55)$$

which in view of Eq. (2.23) has the solution

$$-i\mathbf{D} = i\mathbf{K} + i\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{1} - \hat{\Pi}\mathbf{K}_1)^{-1}\hat{\Pi}\mathbf{K}. \quad (2.56)$$

Insert the known value of the inverse matrix to obtain

$$-i\mathbf{D} = -iD^{PP}(q^2) \begin{pmatrix} A & iB \\ -iB & C \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.57)$$

where  $A, B, C$  are the real matrix elements

$$A = 1 \quad (2.58)$$

$$B = 4G_2f_\pi^2(q^2)\sqrt{\frac{q^2}{m^2}} \quad (2.59)$$

$$C = 2G_2f_\pi^2(q^2)\frac{q^2}{m^2}, \quad (2.60)$$

and where the renormalized propagator for a chiral pion,

$$-iD^{PP}(q^2) = \frac{2iG_1}{1 - 2G_1\hat{\Pi}^{PP}(q^2)} = \frac{-im^2}{q^2f_\pi^2(q^2)} = \frac{-ig_{\pi qq}^2(q^2)}{q^2F_P(q^2)}, \quad (2.61)$$

has been factored out. Here

$$g_{\pi qq}(q^2) = g_p[1 + 8G_2 f_p^2(q^2)]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.62)$$

As shown below, the chiral limit of this function gives the *renormalized*  $\pi qq$  coupling constant  $g_{\pi qq}(0) = g_{\pi qq}$ . The auxillary constants  $f_p$  and  $g_p$  have thus disappeared from the problem, to be replaced by their renormalized values  $f_\pi$  and  $g_{\pi qq}$ . Although this will be justified later by examining the conserved axial current, one already sees that these renormalized values also satisfy the GT relation  $f_\pi g_{\pi qq} = m$ .

The matrix  $\mathbf{D}$  enters into the  $\bar{q}q$  scattering amplitude and has to be diagonalized in order to identify the independent  $\pi$  and longitudinal axial eigenmodes and their coupling constants to the quarks. To this end, we introduce the real symmetric matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ B & C \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.63)$$

that has real eigenvalues

$$\lambda_{\pi, a_L}(q^2) = \frac{1}{2}(A + C) \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(A - C)^2 + 4B^2}, \quad (2.64)$$

where the signs correspond to the identification of the  $\pi$  and  $a_L$  eigenmodes according to the expected limits  $\lambda_\pi \rightarrow 1$ ,  $\lambda_{a_L} \rightarrow 0$  as  $G_2 \rightarrow 0$ . The orthogonal transformation matrix that renders  $\mathbf{M}$  diagonal is

$$\mathbf{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tan 2\theta = \frac{2B}{(A - C)}. \quad (2.65)$$

The scattering amplitude can then be written as follows

$$\begin{aligned} T &= (i\gamma_5\tau, -i\not{q}\gamma_5\tau)\mathbf{M} \begin{pmatrix} i\gamma_5\tau \\ i\not{q}\gamma_5\tau \end{pmatrix} D^{PP} \\ &= (i\gamma_5\tau, -i\not{q}\gamma_5\tau)\mathbf{U}\{\mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{M}\mathbf{U}\}\mathbf{U}^T \begin{pmatrix} i\gamma_5\tau \\ i\not{q}\gamma_5\tau \end{pmatrix} D^{PP} \\ &= T_\pi + T_{a_L}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.66)$$

where

$$T_\pi = [(\cos \theta - \not{q}\sin \theta)i\gamma_5\tau] \otimes [(\cos \theta + \not{q}\sin \theta)i\gamma_5\tau] \lambda_\pi D^{PP}(q^2) \quad (2.67)$$

and

$$T_{a_L} = [(\sin \theta + \not{q} \cos \theta) i \gamma_5 \tau] \otimes [(\sin \theta - \not{q} \cos \theta) i \gamma_5 \tau] \lambda_{a_L} D^{PP}(q^2). \quad (2.68)$$

The separate contributions of the propagating pion and longitudinal axial eigenmodes are now self-evident. However, since the eigenvalue  $\lambda_{a_L} \sim q^2$  as  $q^2 \rightarrow 0$  according to Eq. (2.64), the product  $\lambda_{a_L} D^{PP}(q^2)$  does not have a pole at  $q^2 = 0$ . Thus the longitudinal axial scattering amplitude does not represent a propagating physical particle carrying mass. Nevertheless this amplitude is an essential adjunct to the propagating pion eigenmode, which does represent a physical particle, as far as conservation of the isospin current is concerned, as well as the interaction of the pion with electromagnetic fields. These comments will be elucidated in the later sections. By contrast, from the structure of  $D^{PP}(q^2)$ , it is evident that the pion propagator part of  $T$  does have a pole at  $q^2 = 0$ : the Goldstone mode has been preserved by the RPA. However, as already noted before (see e.g. [8]), the coupling constant of the quarks to the (Goldstone) pion as well as its weak decay constant are renormalized, and an additional pseudovector coupling constant,  $g_{pv}$ , is induced by the  $\pi - a_L$  coupling in the ENJL Lagrangian. One confirms this by examining the residue of  $T_\pi$  at the pole  $q^2 \rightarrow 0$ . In this limit, one finds from Eqs. (2.64) and (2.65) that

$$\lambda_\pi \rightarrow 1 \quad (2.69)$$

$$\cos \theta \rightarrow 1 \quad (2.70)$$

$$\frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{q^2}} \rightarrow 4G_2 \frac{f_\pi^2}{m}. \quad (2.71)$$

Then  $T_\pi$  can be recast as [8]

$$T_\pi \rightarrow [(g_{\pi qq} - \not{q} \frac{g_{pv}}{2m}) i \gamma_5 \tau] \otimes [(g_{\pi qq} + \not{q} \frac{g_{pv}}{2m}) i \gamma_5 \tau] \frac{1}{q^2} \quad (2.72)$$

in the vicinity of the pion pole, that allows one to identify the pseudoscalar and induced pseudovector pion-quark coupling constants  $g_{\pi qq}$  and  $g_{pv}$  as

$$g_{\pi qq} = \lim_{q^2 \rightarrow 0} g_{\pi qq}(q^2) \sqrt{\lambda_\pi(q^2)} \cos \theta = g_p [1 + 8G_2 f_p^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{g_p}{\sqrt{g_A}} \quad (2.73)$$

and

$$g_{pv} = \lim_{q^2 \rightarrow 0} 2m g_{\pi qq}(q^2) \sqrt{\lambda(q^2)} \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{q^2}} = g_{\pi qq}(8G_2 f_\pi^2) = g_{\pi qq}(1 - g_A). \quad (2.74)$$

The quark axial form factor  $g_A$  that is identified in Eq. (2.85) to follow, has been introduced to simplify the final expressions for these two coupling constants.

## F. Chiral symmetry invariance to $\mathcal{O}(N_c)$ in the RPA

Apart from satisfying Goldstone's theorem in the RPA, the ENJL model also obeys the remaining chiral theorems as realized by the Goldberger-Treiman relation and axial current conservation. The Goldberger-Treiman relation can be established by calculating the one pion to vacuum matrix element of the axial current that defines the pion weak decay constant  $f_\pi$ . In the quark model, this matrix element is determined by connecting the vertex for the incoming pion, in this case  $i(g_{\pi qq} - \not{q} g_{pv}/2m)i\gamma_5\tau_b$ , via a quark loop to the axial current vertex  $\gamma_\mu\gamma_5\tau_a/2$ . Since the induced pseudovector term in the  $\pi qq$  interaction only couples to the longitudinal part of the axial polarization, the resulting single quark loop diagram, can be re-expressed in terms of the  $\Pi^{AP}$  and  $\Pi_L^{AA}$ . The details are summarized below. One has

$$\langle 0 | A_{\mu;a} | \pi_b(q) \rangle = i f_\pi q_\mu \delta_{ab} = \frac{1}{2} \Pi_{\mu;ab}^{AP}(0) g_{\pi qq} - \frac{1}{2} \Pi_{\mu\nu;ab}^{AA}(0) q^\nu \frac{i g_{pv}}{2m}. \quad (2.75)$$

But

$$\Pi_{\mu;ab}^{AP}(q^2) = 2i \frac{f_p^2(q^2)}{m} q_\mu \delta_{ab} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_{\mu\nu;ab}^{AA}(q^2) q^\nu = 4f_p^2(q^2) q_\mu \delta_{ab}, \quad (2.76)$$

in view of Eqs. (2.30b) and (2.37). Hence the pion decay constant satisfies the relation

$$f_\pi = \frac{f_p^2}{m} (g_{\pi qq} - g_{pv}). \quad (2.77)$$

However

$$(g_{\pi qq} - g_{pv}) = g_{\pi qq} g_A \quad (2.78)$$

follows from Eqs. (2.73) and (2.74). Inserting this difference into the expression for  $f_\pi$ , one finds

$$f_\pi = \sqrt{g_A} f_p = f_p [1 + 8G_2 f_p^2]^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.79)$$

Thus  $f_\pi$  and  $g_{\pi qq}$  are again connected by a Goldberger-Treiman relation,

$$f_\pi g_{\pi qq} = \sqrt{g_A} f_p \frac{g_p}{\sqrt{g_A}} = m. \quad (2.80)$$

We also establish the axial current conservation for the Lagrangian given by Eq. (2.8) and identify the quark isovector axial form factor. The expected modification of the quark current due to the exchange of transverse axial  $a_1$  plus the  $\pi$  and longitudinal  $a_L$  axial eigenmodes is depicted in Fig. 1. Since the current operator represented by the sum of these diagrams is to eventually be sandwiched between initial and final quark momentum states  $p$



and  $p'$  where  $q = p' - p$  is the momentum entering the vertex, we can freely use the identity  $\not{q}\gamma_5 = 2m\gamma_5$ . Translating the Feynman diagrams in Fig. 1 with the help of Eqs. (2.76), (2.67), (2.68) and (2.54) in terms of the polarization loops and propagators they represent, one finds, after some calculation, that

$$J_{\mu 5}^a = \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \frac{\tau^a}{2} - \frac{2m\gamma_5}{q^2} q_\mu \frac{f_p^2(q^2)}{f_\pi^2(q^2)} \left\{ \lambda_\pi (\cos \theta - \frac{2m}{\sqrt{q^2}} \sin \theta)^2 + \lambda_a (\sin \theta + \frac{2m}{\sqrt{q^2}} \cos \theta)^2 \right\} \frac{\tau^a}{2} - \frac{2G_2 \Pi_T^{AA}}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{AA}} T_{\mu\nu} \gamma^\nu \gamma_5 \frac{\tau^a}{2}. \quad (2.81)$$

The contents of the curly bracket is given by

$$\left\{ \dots \right\} = A + \frac{4m^2}{q^2} C - \frac{4m}{\sqrt{q^2}} B = 1 - 8G_2 f_\pi^2(q^2) = \frac{1}{1 + 8G_2 f_p^2(q^2)}, \quad (2.82)$$

see Eq. (A86) of Appendix A. This just cancels out the factor  $f_p^2(q^2)/f_\pi^2(q^2)$  in view of Eq. (2.41) and we are left with

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\mu 5}^a &= \left( \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 - \frac{2m\gamma_5}{q^2} q_\mu - \frac{2G_2 \Pi_T^{AA}}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{AA}} T_{\mu\nu} \gamma^\nu \gamma_5 \right) \frac{\tau^a}{2} \\ &= \left( g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{q_\mu q_\nu}{q^2} - \frac{2G_2 \Pi_T^{AA}}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{AA}} T_{\mu\nu} \right) \gamma^\nu \gamma_5 \frac{\tau^a}{2} \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{AA}} \right) T_{\mu\nu} \gamma^\nu \gamma_5 \frac{\tau^a}{2} \\ &= G_A(q^2) T_{\mu\nu} \gamma^\nu \gamma_5 \frac{\tau^a}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.83)$$

Thus the axial current is purely transverse and consequently conserved,  $q^\mu J_{\mu 5}^a = 0$ . However the quarks have acquired an axial form factor

$$G_A(q^2) = \frac{1}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{AA}(q^2)} \quad (2.84)$$

associated with the  $\pi + a_L$  and  $a_1$  exchanges that contribute to the current. At zero momentum transfer this gives the renormalized axial coupling as

$$g_A = G_A(0) = [1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{AA}(0)]^{-1} = [1 + 8G_2 f_p^2]^{-1} = [1 - 8G_2 f_\pi^2], \quad (2.85)$$

in view of Eq. (2.38) followed by Eq. (2.79). It will prove useful to introduce a renormalized form for the axial form factor

$$F_A(q^2) = G_A(q^2)/G_A(0) = g_A^{-1} G_A(q^2) \quad (2.86)$$

that has the property that  $F_A(0) = 1$ . One notes the essential role of the axial  $a_1$  degree of freedom in obtaining all of these results. In particular, the presence of the diagonalized

version of the longitudinal axial meson propagator in Eq. (2.81) is crucial for axial current conservation. One also observes that the quark's axial coupling to the current has been reduced from unity down to  $g_A < 1$  by the associated meson clouds. The same remark is true of the weak decay constant that is also reduced below its mean field value to  $f_\pi^2 = g_A f_p^2$ , as shown in Eq. (2.79). Thus one has to identify the renormalized  $f_\pi$  and not  $f_p$  with the physical value of  $\approx 93 \text{ MeV}$ .

Vector current conservation follows in the same way, except that here  $\rho^0$  exchange replaces the  $\pi$  and axial modes. Otherwise the calculation is the same as above. However, the “bare” current and meson exchange current are separately conserved in this case. Translating Fig. 1 once more, one finds

$$J_\mu^a = \left( g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{2G_2 \Pi_T^{VV}}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{VV}} T_{\mu\nu} \right) \gamma^\nu \frac{\tau^a}{2} = \left( \frac{1}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{VV}} \right) T_{\mu\nu} \gamma^\nu \frac{\tau^a}{2} = F_V(q^2) T_{\mu\nu} \gamma^\nu \frac{\tau^a}{2}, \quad (2.87)$$

after invoking the identity  $\not{q} = 0$  that is appropriate when calculating  $\langle p' | J_\mu^a | p \rangle$ . Thus  $J_\mu^a$  is also conserved, and the vector form factor of the quark is

$$F_V(q^2) = \frac{1}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2)}. \quad (2.88)$$

In this case, there is no renormalization at zero momentum transfer,  $F_V(0) = 1$ , since  $\Pi_T^{VV}(0) = 0$ .

## G. Explicit symmetry-breaking and chiral perturbation theory

The results obtained so far all refer to the chiral limit of vanishing current quark mass. We close this section by briefly indicating their extension to the case  $\hat{m} \neq 0$  that is required for the discussion of some of the sum rules in Section III. As a byproduct, this extension will also allow us to make contact and compare with the results of chiral perturbation theory (CHPT) that has been extensively used as a theory for studying hadron properties in the non-perturbative regime of QCD [6,23,38].

When a non-zero current quark mass is included, the gap equation for the new quark mass that replaces the  $m$  of Eq. (2.34) is

$$m^* - \hat{m} = \Sigma(m^*) \approx \Sigma_H(m^*), \quad (2.89)$$

that has a revised solution  $m^* \neq m$ . The changed gap equation alters the structure of the pseudoscalar polarization from that given by Eq. (2.48) to

$$\Pi_{nc}^{PP} = \left\{ \frac{m - \hat{m}}{2G_1 m} + \frac{f_\pi^2(q^2)}{m^2} q^2 \right\}_{m=m^*}, \quad (2.90)$$

evaluated at the new mass  $m^*$ . The new index  $nc$  explicitly denotes the use of non-chiral functions. Carrying out the same set of matrix multiplications as those leading to Eqs. (2.44)-(2.47), it is found that the non-chiral expressions for  $\tilde{\Pi}^{PP}$  and  $\tilde{\Pi}^{AP}$  have exactly the same form as their chiral counterparts, but with  $\hat{\Pi}^{PP}$  replaced by  $\Pi_{nc}^{PP}$ . Furthermore, the longitudinal polarization now no longer vanishes since the associated axial current is not conserved. The final expressions for the non-chiral case are thus

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{nc}^{PP} = \frac{\Pi_{nc}^{PP}(q^2)}{1 - 2G_1 \Pi_{nc}^{PP}(q^2)} \quad (2.91)$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{nc}^{AP} = \frac{2i f_\pi^2(q^2) \sqrt{\frac{q^2}{m^2}}}{1 - 2G_1 \Pi_{nc}^{PP}(q^2)} \quad (2.92)$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{nc}^{PA} = \frac{-2i f_\pi^2(q^2) \sqrt{\frac{q^2}{m^2}}}{1 - 2G_1 \Pi_{nc}^{PP}(q^2)} \quad (2.93)$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{L;nc}^{AA} = \frac{4f_\pi^2(q^2)}{1 - 2G_1 \Pi_{nc}^{PP}(q^2)} \frac{\hat{m}}{m}, \quad (2.94)$$

that do not permit further simplification. All amplitudes now have to be evaluated for a quark mass  $m = m^*$  given by the root of Eq. (2.89).

The propagator matrix representing the mixing of the pion and longitudinal axial vector modes has the same form as before,

$$-i\mathbf{D}_{nc} = -iD_{nc}^{PP}(q^2) \begin{pmatrix} A & iB \\ -iB & C \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.95)$$

with  $A$  and  $B$  unchanged except for being evaluated at  $m = m^*$ , but  $C$  contains an additional term that is proportional to  $\hat{m}$ ,

$$A = 1 \quad (2.96)$$

$$B = 4G_2 f_\pi^2(q^2) \sqrt{\frac{q^2}{m^{*2}}} \quad (2.97)$$

$$C = 2G_2 \left[ \frac{f_\pi^2(q^2)}{m^{*2}} q^2 - (2G_1)^{-1} \frac{\hat{m}}{m^*} [1 - 8G_2 f_\pi^2(q^2)] \right]. \quad (2.98)$$

The propagator for a non-chiral pion,

$$-iD_{nc}^{PP}(q^2) = \frac{2iG_1}{1 - 2G_1 \Pi_{nc}^{PP}(q^2)}, \quad (2.99)$$

has been extracted. The pion pole has thus been shifted away from the Goldstone mode at  $q^2 = 0$  to some finite value at  $q^2 = m_\pi^2$  that gives the mass of the ENJL pion. To lowest order in the current quark mass, this pole lies at

$$m_\pi^2 = \frac{m\hat{m}}{2G_1 f_\pi^2} + O(\hat{m}^2). \quad (2.100)$$

The corresponding pole for the pion mass of the minimal NJL model lies at

$$m_p^2 = \frac{m\hat{m}}{2G_1 f_p^2} + O(\hat{m}^2). \quad (2.101)$$

The quark mass in these expressions now refers to the mass obtained from the gap equation in the chiral limit,  $\hat{m} = 0$ . Using the mean field result,  $m = -2G_1 \langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ , that connects  $m$  to the condensate density in either the NJL or the ENJL version of the model in the chiral limit, one can recast these equations as

$$m_\pi^2 f_\pi^2 = m_p^2 f_p^2 = \frac{m\hat{m}}{2G_1} = -\hat{m} \langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle + O(\hat{m}^2) \quad (2.102)$$

to confirm that the Gell-Mann Oakes Renner current algebra relation [39] is satisfied by either version of the NJL model [9,10].

The diagonalization of the propagator matrix proceeds as before, and one regains Eqs. (2.67) and (2.68) with the rotation angle calculated using the revised values of  $A, B, C$  and with  $D^{PP}$  replaced by  $D_{nc}^{PP}$ . The non-chiral analogs of the pseudoscalar and induced pseudovector coupling constants of Eqs. (2.73) and (2.74) are related to the residue at the pion pole of  $D_{nc}^{PP}(q^2)$ . If we use capital letters to distinguish the non-chiral coupling constants from the chiral ones, then

$$G_{\pi qq} = \lim_{q^2 \rightarrow m_\pi^2} [\partial \Pi_{nc}^{PP} / \partial q^2]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\lambda_\pi(q^2)} \cos \theta \quad (2.103)$$

and

$$G_{pv} = \lim_{q^2 \rightarrow m_\pi^2} 2m^* [\partial \Pi_{nc}^{PP} / \partial q^2]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\lambda_\pi(q^2)} \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{q^2}}. \quad (2.104)$$

The modified quark mass  $m^*$  enters into all these expressions in a very complicated way. However, since the current quark mass ( $\hat{m} \sim 3-5$  MeV) is expected to be of order of (2-3)% of the quark mass that is generated dynamically via the chiral gap equation, a perturbative approach suggests itself [21] that is analogous to the procedure used in CHPT. This approach seeks to express the non-chiral amplitudes in terms of their chiral counterparts to first non-vanishing order in the current quark mass  $\hat{m}$ . Since the relevant physical values of  $q^2 \sim m_\pi^2$  are always of  $O(\hat{m})$ , which in turn are of the same order as the shift  $\delta m = (m^* - m)$  away from the chiral mass, all amplitudes have to be expanded simultaneously in  $q^2$  and  $\delta m$  about zero. Basic to these expansions are the following results:

(i) *The mass shift.* The mass shift  $\delta m$  to  $O(\hat{m})$  is obtained by solving the non-chiral gap equation (2.89) to this order. One finds [21]  $\delta m \approx \hat{m}/8G_1f_p^2$ , a result that can be rewritten in either of the two equivalent forms

$$\delta m = \frac{m_p^2}{4m}, \quad \text{or} \quad \delta m = \frac{g_A m_\pi^2}{4m}, \quad (2.105)$$

that lie between 20 and 13 MeV depending on the parameters used, see Table I. The physical origin of the mass shift  $m \rightarrow m^*$  that is induced can be understood directly in terms of an additional self-energy change due to the  $\sigma$  mode being exchanged between the quark and an external scalar field  $S_0 = \bar{\psi}\psi$ , that is associated with the current quark mass in the Lagrangian. The diagrams entering the gap equation that determine  $m^*$  to  $\mathcal{O}(\hat{m})$  are shown in Fig. 2. The additional quark self-energy that is due to the non-vanishing current quark mass is given diagrammatically by Fig. 2 (b) and (c): translating these Feynman diagrams, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} -i\delta m &= -i\hat{m} + (-i\hat{m})[-i\Pi^{S_0 S_0}(0)][-iD^{S_0 S_0}(0)] \\ &= \frac{-i\hat{m}}{1 - 2G_1\Pi^{S_0 S_0}(0)}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.106)$$

since the  $\sigma$  propagator is given by

$$-iD^{S_0 S_0}(q^2) = \frac{2iG_1}{1 - 2G_1\Pi^{S_0 S_0}(q^2)} = \frac{-im^2}{(q^2 - 4m^2)f_p^2(q^2)}, \quad (2.107)$$

in terms of the scalar polarization of Eq. (2.30c). The  $\sigma$  exchange has generated an effective scalar form factor  $[1 - 2G_1\Pi^{S_0 S_0}(0)]^{-1}$  that modifies the bare current quark mass vertex in an analogous way to what was found for the vector and axial vector current vertices, and its structure as a geometric series in  $G_1$  confirms that the calculation of  $\delta m$  is still non-perturbative in the strong coupling constant. Inserting the zero momentum transfer value of the combination  $1 - 2G_1\Pi^{S_0 S_0}(0) = 8G_1f_p^2$  from Eq. (2.30c), one regains Eq. (2.105).

(ii) *Non-chiral corrections to the pion-quark coupling constants.* The revision of the pion polarization to order  $O(\hat{m}^2)$  is obtained by expanding  $\Pi_{nc}^{PP}$  to lowest in  $q^2$  and  $\delta m$ . To do so, first calculate the variation of the basic integral  $I(q^2)$  in Eq. (2.33) with  $q^2$  and  $m^2$ . We temporarily write  $I(q^2, m^{*2})$  in order to emphasize the two independent variables involved in this function, and obtain

$$I(q^2, m^{*2}) = I(0, m^2) + \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{q^2}{6m^2} - \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{\delta m^2}{m^2} + \dots, \quad (2.108)$$

with the help of the relations

$$\frac{\partial I(0, m^2)}{\partial q^2} = \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{1}{6m^2}; \quad \frac{\partial I(0, m^2)}{\partial m^2} = -\frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{1}{m^2},$$

that are easily established. Here  $m^{*2} = m^2 + \delta m^2 + O(\hat{m}^2)$ , where  $\delta m^2 = 2m\delta m = \frac{1}{2}m_p^2$ , from Eq. (2.105). Hence  $f_p^2(q^2) = -4iN_c m^{*2} I(q^2, m^{*2})$  in Eq. (2.31) has the expansion

$$f_p^2(q^2, m^{*2}) = f_p^2[1 + \frac{q^2}{8\pi^2 f_p^2} - \frac{3m_p^2}{8\pi^2 f_p^2} + \frac{m_p^2}{2m^2} + O(\hat{m}^2)], \quad (2.109)$$

from which one concludes that  $f_\pi^2(q^2)$  of Eq. (2.41) behaves like

$$f_\pi^2(q^2, m^{*2}) = f_\pi^2[1 + \frac{g_A^2}{8\pi^2 f_\pi^2} q^2 + \frac{g_A^2}{2m^2} m_\pi^2 - \frac{3g_A^3}{8\pi^2 f_\pi^2} m_\pi^2 + O(\hat{m}^2)]. \quad (2.110)$$

We have set  $N_c = 3$  in both of these expansions, and used the relations  $m_p^2 = g_A m_\pi^2$  and  $f_p^2 = f_\pi^2/g_A$  to eliminate the NJL values of the pion mass and decay constants in favor of those pertaining to the chiral ENJL case. Then one finds that the pseudoscalar polarization has the expansion

$$\Pi_{nc}^{PP}(q^2, m^{*2}) = \frac{m^* - \hat{m}}{2G_1 m^*} + q^2 \frac{f_\pi^2}{m^2} [1 + \frac{g_A^2}{8\pi^2 f_\pi^2} q^2 - \frac{3g_A^3}{8\pi^2 f_\pi^2} m_\pi^2 - \frac{g_A(1 - g_A)}{2m^2} m_\pi^2 + O(\hat{m}^2)]. \quad (2.111)$$

Accordingly, the derivative of this expression at the ENJL pion mass  $m_\pi$  that enters the determination of the pseudoscalar and pseudovector coupling constants is

$$[\partial \Pi_{nc}^{PP}(q^2, m^{*2})/\partial q^2]_{q^2 \rightarrow m_\pi^2} = g_{\pi qq}^{-2} [1 - g_A^2(3g_A - 2) \frac{m_\pi^2}{8\pi^2 f_\pi^2} - g_A(1 - g_A) \frac{m_\pi^2}{2m^2} + O(\hat{m}^2)]. \quad (2.112)$$

Now, the final determination of the coupling constants, and thus also the non-chiral corrections to the pion weak decay constant, also requires the expansion of the root  $\lambda_\pi(m_\pi^2)$  as well as  $\sin \theta$  and  $\cos \theta$  to lowest order in  $m_\pi^2$ . To obtain these, we need the expanded forms of the coefficients  $A, B$  and  $C$  of Eqs. (2.98). One then finds that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_\pi(m_\pi^2) &\approx 1 + (4G_2 f_\pi^2)^2 \frac{m_\pi^2}{m^2}, \quad \sqrt{\lambda_\pi(m_\pi^2)} \cos \theta \approx 1 \\ (2m^*/m_\pi) \sqrt{\lambda_\pi(m_\pi^2)} \sin \theta &\approx 8G_2 f_\pi^2(m_\pi^2, m^{*2}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.113)$$

to lowest order in  $\hat{m}$ , after dropping terms of  $O(\hat{m}^2)$ . Here, the function  $f_\pi^2(m_\pi^2, m^{*2})$  is given by the expansion in Eq. (2.110) evaluated at  $q^2 = m_\pi^2$ . Hence the coupling constants take the form

$$G_{\pi qq} = g_{\pi qq} [1 + g_A^2(3g_A - 2) \frac{m_\pi^2}{16\pi^2 f_\pi^2} + g_A(1 - g_A) \frac{m_\pi^2}{4m^2} + O(\hat{m}^2)] \quad (2.114)$$

and

$$G_{pv} = g_{\pi qq}(1 - g_A)[1 - 3g_A^3 \frac{m_\pi^2}{16\pi^2 f_\pi^2} + g_A(1 + g_A) \frac{m_\pi^2}{4m^2} + O(\hat{m}^2)]. \quad (2.115)$$

As a check, notice that this last relation correctly reduces to (2.74) in the chiral limit.

(iii) *Non-chiral corrections to the pion mass and weak decay constant.* The values of the physical pion mass and weak decay constant  $M_\pi$  and  $F_\pi$ , expressed as expansions in powers of  $\hat{m}$ , can now be found. The weak decay constant is obtained by evaluating the right hand side of Eq. (2.75) at  $q^2 = m_\pi^2$  instead of zero, while replacing  $g_{\pi qq} - g_{pv}$  by  $G_{\pi qq} - G_{pv}$  and  $m$  by  $m^*$ . One obtains

$$F_\pi = f_\pi [1 + \frac{m_\pi^2}{16\pi^2 f_\pi^2} \underbrace{(4\pi^2 \frac{f_\pi^2}{m^2} g_A^2 - 3g_A^3)}_{\sim l_4^r} + O(\hat{m}^2)], \quad (2.116)$$

to the indicated order. The corrections to the ENJL pion mass of Eq. (2.100) follow upon expanding the defining equation for the value of the pole in the non-chiral propagator  $D_{nc}^{PP}(q^2)$  to higher powers than the first in  $\hat{m}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} M_\pi^2 &= \frac{m^* \hat{m}}{2G_1 f_\pi^2(M_\pi^2, m^{*2})} \\ &= m_\pi^2 [1 - \frac{m_\pi^2}{32\pi^2 f_\pi^2} \underbrace{(8\pi^2 \frac{f_\pi^2}{m^2} g_A(2g_A - 1) - 4g_A^2(3g_A - 1))}_{\sim l_3^r} + O(\hat{m}^2)] \end{aligned} \quad (2.117)$$

after using Eq. (2.100) to eliminate the combination  $m\hat{m}/(2G_1 f_\pi^2) = m_\pi^2$ .

(iv) *The Gasser-Leutwyler coupling constants of chiral perturbation theory.* The coefficients of the  $m_\pi^2$  terms in expansions like Eqs. (2.116) and (2.117) that have been underscored with braces can be used to identify the ENJL model predictions for two of the coupling constants,  $\bar{l}_3$  and  $\bar{l}_4$  of CHPT that were introduced by Gasser and Leutwyler [5]. However, as they stand, these equations actually determine the renormalized coupling constants  $l_i^r$ , and not the scale-invariant versions  $\bar{l}_i$  of Gasser and Leutwyler, which are the physical parameters to be extracted from experiment. The price one pays for introducing the scale invariance in  $\bar{l}_i$  is that the latter coupling constants then all diverge logarithmically like  $-\ln m_\pi^2$  in the chiral limit. Such “chiral logarithms”, that are expected on general grounds [19], only appear in the NJL model or its ENJL extension when non-chiral  $\mathcal{O}(1/N_c)$  corrections to the mean field results are included. As we have not incorporated such corrections into our mean field treatment of the problem, we must identify the underscored quantities not with  $\bar{l}_i$ , but with the combination

$$\bar{l}_i + \ln(m_\pi^2/\mu^2) \sim l_i^r, \quad (2.118)$$

which is well-defined in the chiral limit. Here  $\mu$  is the as yet arbitrary scale parameter of CHPT<sup>7</sup>. This way of including the chiral logarithms has been verified explicitly in the calculation of the pion radius parameter  $\bar{l}_6$  in [20], and for the pion electromagnetic mass difference in [15]. The same conclusion holds for the remaining coupling constants. We thus have

$$\bar{l}_3^{ENJL} + \ln(m_\pi^2/\mu^2) = \{8\pi^2 \frac{f_\pi^2}{m^2} (2g_A - 1) - 4g_A(3g_A - 1)\}g_A \quad (2.119)$$

$$\bar{l}_4^{ENJL} + \ln(m_\pi^2/\mu^2) = \{4\pi^2 \frac{f_\pi^2}{m^2} - 3g_A\}g_A^2. \quad (2.120)$$

These expressions reduce to the values given previously [21] (in a somewhat different form) for the NJL model ( $g_A \rightarrow 1$ ,  $f_\pi^2 \rightarrow f_p^2$  and  $m_\pi^2 \rightarrow m_p^2$ ):

$$\bar{l}_3^{NJL} + \ln(m_p^2/\mu^2) = 8\pi^2 \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} - 8 \quad (2.121)$$

$$\bar{l}_4^{NJL} + \ln(m_p^2/\mu^2) = 4\pi^2 \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} - 3. \quad (2.122)$$

In Eqs.(2.119) and (2.120), the combinations on the left are specified as functions of two physically measurable quantities, the pion decay constant  $f_\pi$  as well as the axial form factor  $g_A$ . The only unknown factor is the quark mass  $m$ . Numerical values for these quantities will be discussed in the next section, after the parameters of the model have been fixed.

## H. Parameters.

The determination of the parameters appearing in the effective Lagrangian follows the standard procedure of attempting to reproduce some of the experimental properties of the mesons and quarks that can be calculated from the model. In the case of the ENJL model with the chiral symmetry-breaking current quark mass included, one has the two interaction strengths,  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , an averaged current quark mass  $\hat{m}$ , and a regulating cutoff  $\Lambda$ , to determine, i.e. four parameters in all. On the other hand, it is clear that the  $\bar{l}_i$ 's derived above to  $\mathcal{O}(\hat{m}^2)$  only refer to the solution for  $m$  from the gap equation (2.34) in the absence

---

<sup>7</sup>The arbitrariness in the choice of the scale  $\mu$  is reflected in the slow logarithmic dependence on it and the overall smallness of the logarithmic correction in any event. This explains the good agreement of previous calculations with the empirical values of the  $\bar{l}_i$ 's, see [21].



of a current quark mass. This is the general situation. We may thus ignore the effect of  $\hat{m}$  on the quark mass, and instead regard  $\hat{m}$  as interchangeable with the pion mass  $m_\pi$  in view of the GMOR relation (2.102) rather than as an additional parameter. This then leaves three parameters to fix:  $G_1, G_2$  and  $\Lambda$ . In order to determine these, we use the physical value  $F_\pi \approx 93\text{MeV}$  of the pion decay constant<sup>8</sup> to fix  $f_\pi$ , coupled with the inferred value of the condensate density per light quark flavor of  $\langle\bar{u}u\rangle \approx \langle\bar{d}d\rangle \sim (-200\text{MeV})^3$  to  $(-300\text{MeV})^3$ , and a typical value for the quark axial form factor  $g_A$  to set these parameters. Choosing the value of  $g_A$  is, according to Eq. (2.85), equivalent to choosing a value for the interaction strength  $G_2$  multiplying the vector fields, once  $f_\pi$  is fixed. We take  $g_A = 0.75$ , since this leads to a correct estimate of the nucleon axial form factor  $g_A^N = (5/3)g_A \approx 1.26$  using the naive quark model formula [8,41]. Then  $G_2$  is fixed at  $G_2 = (1 - g_A)/(8f_\pi^2) = 3.61\text{GeV}^{-2}$ . The ratio  $f_\pi^2/m^2$  follows from Eq. (2.32a) plus  $f_\pi^2 = g_A f_p^2$ . We use the Pauli-Villars (PV) regularization scheme for this calculation. The PV regulated version of Eq. (2.32a) is given by Eq. (A34) in the appendix. One has

$$\frac{f_\pi^2}{m^2} = -\frac{3g_A}{4\pi^2} \sum_{a=0} C_a \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2} = \frac{3g_A}{4\pi^2} L(x)$$

$$L(x) = 2 \ln(1+x) - \ln(1+2x), \quad x = \frac{\Lambda^2}{m^2}, \quad (2.123)$$

for  $N_c = 3$ , after inserting the standard choice [18]  $C_a = (1, 1, -2)$  and  $M_a^2 = m^2 + \alpha_a \Lambda^2$  with  $\alpha = (0, 2, 1)$  for the PV regularization<sup>9</sup>. Thus  $f_\pi^2/m^2$ , and therefore also the combination  $\bar{l}_i + \ln(m_\pi^2/\mu^2)$  are only functions of the one remaining dimensionless combination  $x = \Lambda^2/m^2$ , i.e. the ratio of the square of the regularization scale to the spontaneously generated quark mass at that scale. Thus one may write

---

<sup>8</sup>A more accurate value is  $F_\pi = 92.4\text{MeV}$ , see Ref. [40].

<sup>9</sup>As an aside we comment that, when regulated in  $O(4)$  momentum space, the corresponding expression for  $L(x)$  is

$$L_{O(4)}(x) = \ln(1+x) - x/(1+x)$$

Here  $x = \Lambda_{O(4)}^2/m^2$  and  $\Lambda_{O(4)}$  is a new cutoff. The scaling  $\Lambda_{O(4)}^2 \rightarrow (2 \ln 2) \Lambda^2$  essentially maps this function onto  $L(x)$ , i.e.  $L_{O(4)}[(2 \ln 2)x] \approx L(x)$  to a very high degree of approximation, see Fig. 13 of Ref. [16]. The results to follow are thus essentially unchanged in the  $O(4)$  regularization scheme, apart from requiring a larger cutoff. However, for the reasons already outlined in the Introduction, we prefer to use the PV regularization.

$$\bar{l}_3^{ENJL}(x) + \ln(m_\pi^2/\mu^2) = 6g_A^2(2g_A - 1)L(x) - 4g_A^2(3g_A - 1) \quad (2.124)$$

$$\bar{l}_4^{ENJL}(x) + \ln(m_\pi^2/\mu^2) = (3L(x) - 3)g_A^3, \quad (2.125)$$

which reduce to the especially simple expressions

$$\bar{l}_3^{NJL}(x) + \ln(m_p^2/\mu^2) = 6L(x) - 8 \quad (2.126)$$

$$\bar{l}_4^{NJL}(x) + \ln(m_p^2/\mu^2) = 3L(x) - 3 \quad (2.127)$$

for the NJL values of these coefficients.

For fixed  $f_\pi$  and  $g_A$ , Eq. (2.123) determines how  $m$  must vary with the ratio  $x$ . The corresponding value of the strong coupling  $G_1$  that is required to reproduce this value of  $m$  follows from the gap equation that  $m$  must satisfy. Using the PV regulated version of the gap equation given in the appendix as Eq. (A4) for  $N_c = 3$ , one finds

$$G_1^{-1} = \frac{3m^2}{\pi^2} [2x \ln \{ \frac{1+2x}{1+x} \} - L(x)]. \quad (2.128)$$

Knowing  $G_1$  and  $m$ , the quark condensate density per light quark flavor is then given by

$$-\langle \bar{u}u \rangle = -\langle \bar{d}d \rangle = \frac{m}{4G_1} + O(\hat{m}). \quad (2.129)$$

The variation with  $x = \Lambda^2/m^2$  of the quark mass  $m$  and condensate density is shown in Fig. 3 for the ENJL model. The input parameters are as stated above:  $f_\pi = 93\text{MeV}$  and  $g_A = 0.75$ . If we insist that  $f_p$  must take on the value of the physical pion decay constant of 93MeV for the minimal NJL model case also, then both these quantities simply scale down with  $\sqrt{g_A}$ :  $m_{NJL} = \sqrt{g_A} m_{ENJL}$  and  $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{NJL}^{1/3} = \sqrt{g_A} \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{ENJL}^{1/3}$ , so that  $\Lambda_{NJL} = \sqrt{g_A} \Lambda_{ENJL}$ , and  $\{G_1\}_{NJL} = g_A^{-1} \{G_1\}_{ENJL}$ . It is interesting that the  $\rho$  meson degree of freedom takes no part in this scaling. One notes that both  $m$  and the quark condensate are slow functions of  $x$ : a fourfold change from  $x = 4$  to  $x = 16$  can accomodate an uncertainty in the empirical value of the condensate density that lies between  $-(300\text{MeV})^3 \leq \langle \bar{u}u \rangle \leq -(250\text{MeV})^3$ . A comparison of the parameters and the numerical results for the two cases is given in Table I for  $x = 16$ .

In Tables II and III, we have compiled the analytic expressions and predicted numerical values for the Gasser-Leutwyler scale-independent coupling parameters as extracted from Eqs. (2.124), (2.125) for  $\bar{l}_3$  and  $\bar{l}_4$  for both the NJL and ENJL models, and compared these values with experiment. In addition, we have included the values of  $\bar{l}_5$ ,  $\bar{l}_6$  and  $l_7$  (for which there is no barred version) and which are calculated from Eqs. (3.39) and (4.7) as well as Eq. (3.52) in the sections to come.

The predicted values for these parameters have been calculated using the same input data as for Table I. The logarithmic contribution is shown separately in this table. This contribution has been calculated at the scale  $\mu = 2m_\sigma \approx 2m = 485\text{MeV}$  or  $528\text{MeV}$  respectively in these two cases, that is suggested by the structure of the pion radius calculation [20]. Gasser and Leutwyler fix  $\mu = M_\eta = 549\text{MeV}$  at the  $\eta$  meson mass. From this table, one notes (i) that either version of the model gives very similar predictions for the coupling constants of chiral perturbation theory, and (ii) that the agreement with the empirical data is quite acceptable, the more so since no attempt was made to fit any of the  $l'$ 's directly. The only exception to this is  $\bar{l}_3$ , which is more than twice as large as the suggested empirical value which, however, carries a large error.

### III. SPECTRAL DENSITY FUNCTIONS AND SUM RULES

In this section, we construct the spectral density functions that give the meson mode (mass)<sup>2</sup> strength distributions in the various channels, and discuss their sum rule properties. Six such spectral functions can be defined and there are eight sum rules linking them that we discuss. We first introduce the spectral functions, and we then evaluate them in the ensuing subsections within the ENJL model.

We start with the isovector vector and axial vector polarization given by Eq. (2.5) and consider their spectral densities  $\rho^J$ . We write

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle 0 | V_\mu^a(x) V_\nu^b(0) | 0 \rangle = \rho_1^V(q^2) (-T_{\mu\nu}) \delta^{ab} \quad (3.1a)$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle 0 | A_\mu^a(x) A_\nu^b(0) | 0 \rangle = \rho_1^A(q^2) (-T_{\mu\nu}) \delta^{ab} + \rho_0^A(q^2) L_{\mu\nu} \delta^{ab}. \quad (3.1b)$$

The subscripts 0 and 1 indicate the spin projection carried by these spectral densities. Since the normalized transverse and longitudinal projectors  $T_{\mu\nu}$  and  $L_{\mu\nu}$  where  $T_{\mu\nu} + L_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu}$  have been used, these identifications of the vector and axial vector densities agree with those introduced in Weinberg's original paper on sum rules, and equal  $q^2$  times the vector densities of Gasser and Leutwyler [5].

In a seminal paper [2], Weinberg proved two QCD sum rules that now bear his name, and which are obeyed by the inverse moments of these spectral densities in the chiral limit in which both the vector and axial vector currents are conserved:

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s)) = f_\pi^2 + O(\hat{m}) \quad (3.2a)$$

$$\int_0^\infty ds (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s)) = O(\hat{m}). \quad (3.2b)$$

The first sum rule is exactly fulfilled in the chiral limit, where, as our notation suggests,  $f_\pi^2$  represents the value of the *physical* weak decay constant  $F_\pi^2 = f_\pi^2 + O(\hat{m})$  in the limit of vanishing pion mass. The second sum rule contains additional QCD corrections [1,3]. These relations assume (see Ref. [1] for a recent overview) that the associated polarization functions satisfy unsubtracted dispersion relations. Then, with the aid of the Källen-Lehmann spectral representation [18], one can write

$$\frac{1}{4}\tilde{\Pi}_T^{JJ}(s) = -\int_0^\infty dt \frac{\rho^J(t)}{t-s} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_0^\infty dt \frac{Im[\tilde{\Pi}_T^{JJ}(t)]}{t-s}, \quad (3.3)$$

with  $J = V, A$ , after setting  $s = q^2$ . The spectral density distributions for the vector and axial vector polarizations are then

$$\rho_1^J(s) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} Im[\tilde{\Pi}_T^{JJ}(s)], \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_0^A(s) = \frac{1}{4\pi} Im[\tilde{\Pi}_L^{AA}(s)]. \quad (3.4)$$

In addition to the Weinberg sum rules for the vector and axial vector densities, further sum rules have been derived by Gasser and Leutwyler for higher inverse moments of these densities, as well as for the moments of the scalar and pseudoscalar densities, that are specific to expansions in the current quark mass  $\hat{m}$  in the context of chiral perturbation theory [5]. To introduce these sum rules, we use the same definitions as these authors in the scalar - pseudoscalar sector and write

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle 0 | S^0(x) S^0(0) | 0 \rangle = \rho^S(q^2) \quad (3.5a)$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle 0 | P^a(x) P^b(0) | 0 \rangle = \rho^P(q^2) \delta^{ab} \quad (3.5b)$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle 0 | S^a(x) S^b(0) | 0 \rangle = \tilde{\rho}^S(q^2) \delta^{ab} \quad (3.5c)$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle 0 | P^0(x) P^0(0) | 0 \rangle = \tilde{\rho}^P(q^2) \quad (3.5d)$$

with

$$\rho^J(s) = \frac{1}{\pi} Im[\tilde{\Pi}^{JJ}(s)] \quad (3.6)$$

for the scalar and pseudoscalar correlators: here  $J = S, P$  identifies the character of the relevant density operator. The tilde over the scalar isovector and pseudoscalar isoscalar spectral densities in Eqs. (3.5c) and (3.5d) serves to distinguish them from the isoscalar and isovector densities of the same spatial character in the first pair of equations. The density operators appearing in these correlation functions have been defined in Eqs. (2.3) and (2.4). Then Gasser and Leutwyler show by standard techniques [1] that

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s^2} (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s)) = \frac{1}{48\pi^2} (\bar{l}_5 - 1) + O(\hat{m}) \quad (3.7a)$$

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s^2} \rho_0^A(s) = \frac{f_\pi^2}{m_\pi^2} + O(\hat{m}), \quad (3.7b)$$

to the indicated order in  $\hat{m}$ . Two further sum rules that require a non-vanishing current quark mass are

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \hat{m}^2 (\rho^S(s) - \rho^P(s)) = -f_\pi^2 m_\pi^2 + O(\hat{m}^2) \quad (3.8a)$$

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \hat{m}^2 (\tilde{\rho}^S(s) - \tilde{\rho}^P(s)) = -2m_\pi^4 l_7 + O(\hat{m}^3). \quad (3.8b)$$

As noted previously,  $f_\pi^2$  and  $m_\pi^2$  refer to the lowest non-vanishing order expressions for the pion decay constant and pion mass, considered as a function of  $\hat{m}$ ;  $\bar{l}_5$  and  $l_7$  are simply two further parameters introduced by CHPT. These authors also show that

$$\int_0^\infty ds (\rho^S(s) - \rho^P(s)) = O(\hat{m}) \quad (3.9a)$$

$$\int_0^\infty ds (\tilde{\rho}^S(s) - \tilde{\rho}^P(s)) = O(\hat{m}), \quad (3.9b)$$

that mimic Weinberg's second sum rule for the scalar minus pseudoscalar densities.

### A. Vector densities and their properties

Recently it was shown [17] that Weinberg's first sum rule is obeyed exactly, and the second sum rule obeyed in modified form, by the vector and axial vector densities generated by *both* the NJL model and its ENJL extension, provided that these densities were calculated from polarization functions that were PV-regulated. Here we expand on these, perhaps unexpected, results and also extend the discussion to cover the remaining sum rules stated above.

We first examine the vector and axial vector spectral densities for the NJL model. These correspond to densities at the one-loop level of approximation. Their difference comes directly from the imaginary part of the Ward identity relation in Eq. (2.37) after Pauli-Villars regularization. The result is

$$\rho_1^{(0)V}(s) - \rho_1^{(0)A}(s) = \frac{N_c m^2}{4\pi^2} \left\{ \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m^2}{s}} \theta(s - 4m^2) \right\}_{PV} \sim -\frac{N_c m^2}{\pi^2} \frac{\Lambda^4}{s^2}, \quad s \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.10)$$

which is derived in detail in the appendix as Eq. (A55), and where the PV notation is defined. Without the PV-regulating instruction in place, this difference reaches the constant value  $N_c m^2/(4\pi^2)$  at large  $s$ , and neither sum rule would converge. With it, this difference is

sufficiently convergent to give finite answers for both sum rules. By direct integration, one in fact finds that

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} (\rho_1^{(0)V}(s) - \rho_1^{(0)A}(s)) = f_p^2, \quad (\text{NJL}), \quad (3.11)$$

while

$$\int_0^\infty ds (\rho_1^{(0)V}(s) - \rho_1^{(0)A}(s)) = -m \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle \neq 0. \quad (\text{NJL}). \quad (3.12)$$

Details of this calculation can be found in Eqs. (A57) and (A59). Thus the PV-regulated vector spectral densities of the minimal NJL model continue to obey the sum rules even though these one-loop densities do not contain any vector or axial vector resonances structures of any kind. One sees that the first Weinberg sum rule is obeyed exactly, with  $f_\pi^2$  replaced by its mean field equivalent  $f_p^2$  appropriate to the NJL model. In particular, one realises that the PV regularization of the NJL spectral densities has introduced *precisely* the correct amount of additional negative or “unphysical” spectral density to satisfy the first Weinberg sum rule exactly<sup>10</sup>. The second sum rule is obeyed in a modified form that is connected with the existence of the quark condensate in the NJL ground state. Only for the case that the condensate density vanishes, does the second Weinberg relation hold exactly. The value of the right hand side of Eq.(3.12) is typically  $(250\text{MeV})^4$  in the broken phase.

The situation for the ENJL generated spectral densities is quite different. Now quark-quark interactions are taken into account that effectively screen out the undesirable high energy behavior of the one-loop densities, as is shown below. This in turn means that two possibilities are available: (i) to PV-regulate both the real and imaginary parts of the irreducible polarization functions, which implies that these satisfy an unsubtracted dispersion relation involving PV-regulated spectral densities. Polarizations and associated quantities that are calculated in this scheme are denoted as “barred” functions in the following. (ii) Alternately, one can regulate only the real part of the irreducible polarization functions, leaving the imaginary part and thus the spectral densities unregulated. Such a polarization

---

<sup>10</sup>We also remark that the same sum rules for the NJL densities are obtained if the the polarization functions  $\Pi_T^{VV}(s)$  and  $\Pi_T^{AA}(s)$  that generate them are regulated via an  $O(4)$  cutoff in momentum space. However the problem then is that the ‘Ward identity’, Eq. (2.37), that lies at the root of both sum rules does not necessarily hold without introducing additional assumptions to deal with the non-uniqueness of regulating quadratic divergences under  $O(4)$ . This difficulty is discussed further in Refs. [37] and [15]. We do not employ the  $O(4)$  regularization method in this paper.

function satisfies a once subtracted dispersion relation containing unregulated spectral densities. These quantities are denoted as “unbarred” in what follows. Details of the schemes are given in the appendix. There it is shown explicitly that, from the point of view of dispersion relations, the distinction between the barred and unbarred amplitudes can be traced back to using either the PV-regulated or unregulated one-loop spectral densities in the dispersion relation calculations given in Eqs. (A48) and (A52).

We now examine the ENJL-generated spectral densities as regulated in the barred scheme and show in more detail that the same form of results as was found for the NJL model in Eqs.(3.11) and (3.12) also hold in the ENJL case. The vector and axial vector densities are obtained from the corresponding polarization functions that include all interactions in the RPA approximation, as recorded in Eqs. (2.11) and (2.13). Then

$$\rho_1^V(s) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \text{Im} \left( \frac{\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s)}{1 + 2G_2 \bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s)} \right) \quad (3.13)$$

$$\rho_1^A(s) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \text{Im} \left( \frac{\bar{\Pi}_T^{AA}(s)}{1 + 2G_2 \bar{\Pi}_T^{AA}(s)} \right). \quad (3.14)$$

The barred polarization functions are given in Eqs. (A46b) and (A54a) of the appendix. Carrying out the indicated operations, one finds that

$$\rho_1^V(s) = \rho_1^{(0)V}(s) |\bar{F}_V(s)|^2 \quad (3.15)$$

$$\rho_1^A(s) = \rho_1^{(0)A}(s) |\bar{G}_A(s)|^2, \quad (3.16)$$

where  $\bar{F}_V$  and  $\bar{G}_A$  are defined in Eqs. (2.88) and (2.84) with  $\Pi$  replaced by its regulated version  $\bar{\Pi}$ . Thus the densities of the ENJL model are simply those of the minimal NJL model, modified by the modulus squared of the corresponding quark current form factor.

Plots of the ENJL vector and axial vector densities are shown in Fig. 4 using the typical set of parameters given in the second line of Table I that are appropriate in the chiral limit (we refer in the following to this set of parameters as the standard set). The different threshold momentum dependence of the spectral densities in Fig. 4 comes about via the behavior of the factors  $\rho_1^{(0)V}$  or  $\rho_1^{(0)A}$ . These factors behave like  $p^{2L+1} = p$  or  $p^3$ , where  $p = (1/2)\sqrt{s - 4m^2}$  is the decay momentum for the decay of the spin one bosons with  $J^{PC} = 1^{--}$  or  $1^{++}$  respectively into a  $\bar{q}q$  pair. The  $L$  dependence comes about since the parity and charge conjugation quantum numbers of the  $\bar{q}q$  system are given by  $P = -(-1)^L$  and  $C = (-1)^{L+S}$ . The opposite parity and charge conjugation in the two channels then requires that the spins of the  $\bar{q}q$  pair be aligned to  $S = 1$  in both cases, but also to carry internal angular momentum  $L = 1$  in the second case. One sees that the presence of the quark form factors drastically redistributes both spectral densities, causing a pile-up of

strength at low momentum transfers  $s = q^2$  by suppressing the high energy tails of  $\rho_1^{(0)V}$  and  $\rho_1^{(0)A}$ . However, at large values of  $s$ , both spectral densities become negative due to the asymptotic behavior of the regulated one loop densities  $\rho_1^{(0)V}$  and  $\rho_1^{(0)A}$ . This is shown explicitly in Fig. 5 for the vector density of both the ENJL case and the (one loop) NJL case. The strong redistribution of the vector strength due to the inclusion of the vector mode is especially clear in this figure. In this case, the redistribution of strength takes place in such a manner that the integral over  $\rho_1^V(s)/s$  always vanishes.

In Fig. 6, we have shown the difference  $\rho_1^{(V)} - \rho_1^{(A)}$ , plotted out to values of  $s$  that extend beyond both PV-induced thresholds, to illustrate the extent of modification introduced by the vector and axial vector degrees of freedom. Again one sees that there is a pile-up of strength at low momentum transfers.

If one were to follow the second, unbarred regularization scheme, then the PV-regulated one-loop NJL spectral densities of Eqs. (A50) and (A56) are replaced by their unregulated versions

$$\rho_1^{(0)V}(s) \rightarrow \frac{N_c s}{24\pi^2} \left\{ \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m^2}{s}} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{4m^2}{s} \right) \theta(s - 4m^2) \right\} \quad (3.17)$$

and

$$\rho_1^{(0)A}(s) \rightarrow \frac{N_c s}{24\pi^2} \left\{ \sqrt[3]{1 - \frac{4m^2}{s}} \theta(s - 4m^2) \right\} \quad (3.18)$$

in Eqs. (3.15) and (3.16). This effectively removes the bars on  $F_V(s)$  and  $G_A(s)$ . Since

$$\rho_1^V(s) \sim \rho_1^A(s) \sim \frac{1}{s(\ln |s|)^2}, \quad |s| \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.19)$$

from Table VI, one then obtains spectral densities for the ENJL model that, on the one hand, always remain positive definite, instead of behaving like  $-1/s$ , but which on the other hand, are essentially indistinguishable from those given in Fig. 4 over the resonance regions on the scale of this figure. Later we discuss some consequences of making this choice of regularization instead.

If one associates the peaks in either the regulated or unregulated spectral densities with the masses squared  $m_\rho^2$  and  $m_{a_1}^2$  of the  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  modes of the ENJL model, then for our standard set of parameters, one finds  $m_\rho = 0.713\text{GeV}$  and  $m_{a_1} = 1.027\text{GeV}$  from Fig. 4. This is in fact in reasonable qualitative agreement with the measured values [33] of these meson masses, which lie at  $0.768\text{GeV}$  and  $1.230\text{GeV}$  respectively. However, since both spectral densities peak above the  $\bar{q}q$  decay threshold at  $4m^2$ , which is unphysical from the point of view of confinement, the identification of these peaks with the meson mode masses



can be questioned. On the other hand, we show below that Weinberg's first sum rule is satisfied exactly by the associated vector minus axial vector densities that exhibit these peak values, so that the integrated strength is *exactly* reproduced in accordance with the tenets of chiral symmetry, on which this sum rule is based. In fact, in Weinberg's original treatment [2], the meson masses were determined by saturating this sum rule with delta function strength distributions for the vector and axial vector spectral densities that simply ignored the presence of any decay channels as a first approximation. Since the ENJL spectral densities also saturate the first sum rule, it is thus reasonable to use the peak values of these spectral densities (that have been broadened by replacing the physical  $\rho \rightarrow \pi\pi$  and  $a_1 \rightarrow \rho\pi$  decay channels by the unphysical  $\bar{q}q$  decay channel in each case) to identify the associated meson masses in the ENJL model, with, as we have seen, not dissimilar predictions for these masses.

The masses of these modes should on the general basis of propagator theory also be related to the poles of the corresponding propagators. Below we investigate the analytic structure of the form factors  $F_V(s)$  and  $F_A(s)$ , or equivalently the transverse vector and axial vector propagators  $D_T^{VV}(s)$  and  $D_T^{AA}(s)$  given in Eqs. (2.52) and (2.54).

### 1. Pole structure of the $\rho$ and $a_1$ propagators

One knows on general grounds [18] that any complex poles in the scattering amplitudes or propagators  $D_T^{VV}(s)$  and  $D_T^{AA}(s)$  that correspond to physical resonances must be located on their second (or “unphysical”) Riemann sheets of the cut  $s$ -plane, for reasons of causality. From Eqs. (2.52) and (2.54), one sees that the poles of these functions as a function of  $s$  are governed by the roots of the combinations

$$1 + 2G_2\Pi_T^{VV}(s) \quad \text{and} \quad 1 + 2G_2\Pi_T^{AA}(s). \quad (3.20)$$

We will find that for a range of coupling strengths  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , including those in our standard parameter set of Table I, the axial vector mode has a single pole in the lower half plane of the second Riemann sheet, while the vector mode has two poles on that sheet: a real root below  $4m^2$ , corresponding to a virtual bound state, and a second complex root in the lower half plane. The positions of the two  $\rho$  poles and the  $a_1$  pole are given numerically in Table IV for the standard ENJL parameter set. Details of this analysis now follow.

We discuss the vector mode first. According to Eqs. (A46b) and (A46c), the polarization function for this channel is given by

$$\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s) = -\frac{2}{3}\frac{f_p^2}{m^2}s + \frac{N_c s}{6\pi^2}\left\{\frac{1}{3} + (3-f)(\sqrt{f}\coth^{-1}\sqrt{f}-1)\right\}_{PV}, \quad (3.21)$$

where  $f = 1 - 4m^2/s$ . This form of the regulated vector polarization function satisfies an unsubtracted dispersion relation exactly of the form given in Eq. (3.3), if the PV-regularization instruction is left in place on the second factor. If this instruction is removed (we indicate this by removing the bar) then  $\Pi_T^{VV}(s)/s$  satisfies a once-subtracted dispersion relation. A detailed derivation of these statements is found in the appendix.

The analytic properties of  $\Pi_T^{VV}(s)$  are determined by the behavior of the function

$$J(z) = \sqrt{f} \coth^{-1} \sqrt{f}, \quad f = 1 - \frac{1}{z},$$

that is defined in Eq. (A11), with  $z = s/4m^2$ . Considered as a function of a complex variable  $z$ , this function is single-valued in the cut  $z$ -plane with the cut extending from  $z = 1$  to  $\infty$  along the real axis. The schedule of forms for  $J(z)$  and its analytic continuation  $\tilde{J}(z)$  onto the contiguous Riemann sheet connected through this cut is given in Eqs. (A20) through (A21). These expressions show that both  $J(x)$  and  $\tilde{J}(x)$  are real in the interval  $0 \leq x \leq 1$  on the real axis. Plots of the real part of  $J(z)$  and  $\tilde{J}(z)$  as a function of the real variable  $z = s/4m^2$ , are shown in Fig. 7.

The corresponding behavior of the real part of  $\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s)$  is shown in Fig. 8 as a function of the real variable  $z = s/4m^2$  on the first and second sheets of the cut  $s$ -plane. For  $s \geq 4m^2$  this function has to be continued onto the upper lip of the cut in accord with the Feynman prescription [18]. The values of the polarization along the upper lip of the cut on the first sheet join smoothly with their analytic continuation onto the lower lip of the cut on the second sheet. At the branch point, these values bifurcate into two branches of the function that assume different values along the sector  $0 \leq z \leq 1$  of the two sheets. The values on the first and second sheets are reached by allowing the variable  $z$  to pass either infinitesimally above or infinitesimally below the branch point through the cut to reach this sector of the real axis. As the vector polarization in Eq. (3.21) also has contributions from  $J'$ s at different arguments  $s/4M_a^2$ ,  $a = 1, 2$  due to the PV-instruction, further cuts starting at  $z = 1 + \Lambda^2/m^2$  and  $z = 1 + 2\Lambda^2/m^2$  have to be introduced. However, since  $\Lambda^2/m^2$  is typically  $\sim 16$ , both of these cuts commence too far away to the right of the origin to essentially alter the behavior of  $\Pi_T^{VV}(s)$  as determined by  $J(s/4m^2)$  alone in the interval  $0 < s/4m^2 < 1$ . Hence the cusp-like structure where the values of  $Re \bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s)/4m^2$  and its analytic continuation meet at  $s/4m^2 = 1$  in Fig. 8 is a straightforward reflection of the behavior of  $Re J(z)$  in Fig. 7.

The roots in  $z = s/4m^2$  where

$$1 + 2G_2 \bar{\Pi}^{VV}(s_\rho) = 0, \tag{3.22}$$

determine the poles of the  $\rho$  propagator. We now verify that the vector mode has two poles on the second sheet, one on the real axis below  $4m^2$ , and a second complex pole in the lower half plane. As pointed out in [30], the real pole corresponds having the quark-antiquark pairs making up the vector meson bound into a virtual, (or “antibound”) state [46].

We briefly discuss this state first: according to Fig. 8, the function  $\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(z)/4m^2$  is real and negative on both of its branches for real  $z$  in the interval  $0 < z < 1$ . Hence Eq. (3.22) always has one real root lying in this interval on either the first or the second sheet depending on where the ratio  $\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(z)/4m^2$  crosses  $-1/8G_2m^2$ . The solid circles mark the intercepts of  $\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(z)/4m^2$  with the value of this quantity as the interaction strength  $G_2$  increases through the indicated set of values. The value of  $m$  has been kept fixed at 264 MeV for this illustration. These intercepts determine the position of the real pole of the vector mode propagator lying in the interval  $0 \leq s/4m^2 \leq 1$  as a function of the interaction strength. One sees from the figure that as  $G_2$  increases from zero there is only a *second* sheet real pole, corresponding to a virtual bound state mentioned above for the  $\bar{q}q$  pairs making up the  $\rho$ . The binding energy of the virtual state decreases to zero as  $G_2$  increases through the critical value  $G_2^{(c)} = -1/2\Pi_T^{VV}(4m^2) = 7.41 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$  in the present case. After this, the pole reappears on the *first* or physical sheet where it represents a true bound state of the  $\bar{q}q$  system whose binding energy again increases towards the limiting value of  $2m$  with increasing  $G_2$ , which it reaches<sup>11</sup> as  $G_2 \rightarrow \infty$ . We have plotted the motion of the pole versus the interaction strength  $G_2$  in Fig. 9 with  $G_2$  as ordinate, in order to best illustrate the turn around of the binding energy as  $G_2$  passes through its critical value. For our standard parameter set given in Table I, this root corresponds to a virtual bound state at the pole position  $s_\rho = (0.166)4m^2 = 0.046 \text{ GeV}^2$ , and therefore of mass  $\sqrt{s_\rho} = 0.215 \text{ GeV}$ .

By contrast, the axial vector propagator has a single complex pole, which we discuss together with the complex pole of the vector mode. The axial vector polarization can be obtained directly from the Ward identity relation (2.37) and the regulated form of the pion form factor  $\bar{F}_P(s)$ , that is given in Eq. (A35b). One has

$$\bar{\Pi}_T^{AA}(s) = \bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s) + 4f_p^2 \bar{F}_P(s) \quad (3.23)$$

where

---

<sup>11</sup>As a consequence, the ENJL groundstate always stays stable against the development of an RPA-like instability where  $\sqrt{s_\rho}$  becomes pure imaginary, which would be the signal for the formation of a “vector” condensate.

$$\bar{F}_P(s) = [1 - \frac{N_c m^2}{4\pi^2 f_p^2} \{2\sqrt{f} \coth^{-1} \sqrt{f} - 2\}_{PV}]. \quad (3.24)$$

Contrary to Eq. (3.22), the condition

$$1 + 2G_2 \bar{\Pi}_T^{AA}(s_{a_1}) = 0, \quad (3.25)$$

that determines the poles  $s_{a_1}$  of the  $a_1$  propagator, does not have any real roots on either sheet, since  $Re\bar{F}(s)$  is positive on both sheets, and overrides the negative vector polarization along the real axis. Then  $\bar{\Pi}_T^{AA}(s)$  is real and positive for  $0 < s < 4m^2$  and no solutions of Eq. (3.25) for real  $z$  are possible. However, both Eqs. (3.22) and (3.25) have complex roots located on the second Riemann sheet which may be found by replacing both of the polarization functions in these equations by their analytic continuations through the cut. In Fig. 10, the variation of the imaginary versus the real part of the second sheet poles of the  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  propagators obtained in this way is shown with increasing interaction strength. One observes (i) that the  $\rho$  meson pole has a real part that always lies below  $4m^2$ , for the indicated range of  $G_2$ , and (ii) that the imaginary parts of both complex poles are of the order larger or equal to their real parts.

Since the poles themselves are of order unity in units of  $4m^2$ , and this is much smaller than the cutoff scale  $4\Lambda^2$ , we also want to make the point that the numerical results for the  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  meson poles, as well as the values of the polarization functions in their vicinity, are actually insensitive to the replacement of these functions in Eqs. (3.22) and (3.25) by their “unbarred” counterparts  $\Pi_T^{VV}(s)$  and  $\Pi_T^{AA}(s)$ . In particular, they are insensitive to the actual value of the cutoff employed. This is illustrated in Table IV, where the two  $\rho$  poles and the single  $a_1$  pole are given in units of  $4m^2$  for our standard parameter set. The differences are insignificant. One can see the reason for this more clearly by making comparative plots of the vector and axial vector polarization functions generated via their unsubtracted and subtracted dispersion relations. From Fig. 11, one observes that these two versions of both the vector and axial vector polarizations are essentially identical in the interval  $-1 < q^2/4m^2 < 1$ , where the influence of the additional branch points introduced by using PV-regulated densities have not yet made themselves felt<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>12</sup>It should be pointed out that in a low energy expansion [8,13,42] where the non-analytic terms are dropped from  $\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s)$  and  $\bar{\Pi}_T^{AA}(s)$ , the ENJL model leads to approximate meson poles that are real. One then finds delta function spectral densities of strengths  $g_V^2$  and  $g_{A_1}^2$  that automatically obey the Weinberg relations  $g_V^2 = g_{A_1}^2$  and  $g_V^2 m_V^{-2} - g_{A_1}^2 m_A^{-2} = f_\pi^2$  (as distinct from the sum rules).

One can state this result in yet another way: removing the PV-instruction from the second term of the vector polarization function  $\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s)$  in Eq. (3.21) is tantamount to removing the explicit cutoff dependence in the vector polarization function, while leaving it buried implicitly in the quark mass  $m$  in the first term. The values of the roots themselves

---

To be precise,

$$\frac{1}{4}\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s) \approx -\frac{f_\pi^2}{6g_A m^2}s, \quad \frac{1}{4}\bar{\Pi}_T^{AA}(s) \approx \frac{f_\pi^2}{6g_A m^2}(6m^2 - s)$$

from Eqs. (3.21) and (3.23). This approximation replaces the exact curves for  $\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s)$  and  $\bar{\Pi}_T^{AA}(s)$  shown in Fig. 11 by tangent lines at  $s = 0$ . This completely suppresses all meson dynamics associated with the branch cut. In particular, all information regarding the properties of the second sheet poles of the  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  meson modes is lost. Clearly such an approximation is qualitative at best, since it simply ignores the unphysical decay channels that reflect the non-confining nature of the ENJL Lagrangian. Its use leads to meson-quark coupling constants  $g_{\rho qq}^{-2} = g_{a_1 qq}^{-2} = f_\pi^2/6g_A m^2$  as given by the common derivative  $(-1/4)\partial\Pi/\partial s$  for  $V$  and  $A$ , and meson masses  $m_V^2 = 6g_A m^2/(1 - g_A)$  and  $m_A^2 = 6m^2/(1 - g_A)$ , where  $m_A^2/m_V^2 = g_A^{-1}$ . The factor  $1/4$  arises in calculating the coupling constants if we take the standard form [43] of the interaction Lagrangian as  $\mathcal{L}_{int} = g_{\rho qq}(\bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu\frac{1}{2}\tau^b\psi)\rho_b^\mu$  or  $g_{a_1 qq}(\bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5\frac{1}{2}\tau^b\psi)a_{1,b}^\mu$  for coupling the quark currents to the meson fields. Because of the approximations, these meson modes have delta function distributions as their spectral densities, of equal strengths  $g_V^2 = g_{A_1}^2 = (m_V^2/g_{\rho qq})^2 = f_\pi^2 m_V^4/(6g_A m^2)$ . Inserting this information into Weinberg's sum rules, one finds that his two relations quoted above are satisfied (this is not yet a check of the sum rules themselves for the ENJL model, as the approximations involved are inappropriate). The universality relation  $g_{\rho qq} = f_\rho$  between the  $\rho$  meson coupling constant and its decay constant  $f_\rho$ , reflecting vector meson dominance [43] of the electromagnetic current, is also recovered from the vacuum to one meson state matrix element [1] ( $n_\mu$  is the vector meson polarization)

$$n^\mu \langle 0 | V_\mu^0 | \rho^0 \rangle = -\frac{1}{4}g_{\rho qq}\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(m_V^2) = \frac{m_V^2}{f_\rho}$$

that governs the  $\rho^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$  decay. After inserting the values of  $g_{\rho qq}$  and  $\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(m_V^2)$ , one finds  $g_{\rho qq} = f_\rho = f_\pi^{-1}\sqrt{6g_A m^2}$  that also can be written in the form  $f_\rho f_\pi = m_V(1 - g_A)^{1/2}$ . For  $g_A = 1/2$ , this is exactly the KSFR relation [44]. Then one also recovers Weinberg's original estimate  $m_A/m_V = \sqrt{2}$  for the mass ratio, as well as the  $\rho$  meson mass  $m_V = \sqrt{6}m$  of the bosonized NJL model [45]. For the standard parameter set of Table I this low energy expansion limit gives  $m_V = 1.12 \text{ GeV} (0.768)$ ,  $m_A = 1.29 \text{ GeV} (1.230)$ , and  $f_\rho = 6.02 (5.10)$  [1]. The experimental values are in brackets.

are then solely determined by the physical input parameters  $f_\pi$  and  $g_A$  once  $m$  (which of course contains the cutoff implicitly) has been calculated from the gap equation. The differences between the numbers appearing in the first and second rows of Table IV thus reflect the extent of the explicit cutoff dependence of the roots. However, we learn another, equally important feature, from these plots: both the vector and axial vector polarization functions that arise from subtracted dispersion relations become negative for large space-like  $q^2$ . For the standard parameter set, this has occurred at  $-q^2/4m^2 \sim 10$ , or  $\sqrt{-s} = 1.7 \text{ GeV}$ , but it is clearly a general property. This can be traced to the different asymptotic behavior displayed by the barred and unbarred polarization functions,  $\bar{\Pi}(s) \sim -(1/s) \ln(-s)$  versus  $\Pi(s) \sim s \ln(-s)$ , see Table VI. The former expression stays positive for space-like  $s$ , vanishing at infinity, while the latter function becomes large and negative. This feature in both polarization functions generated via once-subtracted dispersion relations means that the unbarred versions  $1 + 2G_2\Pi_T^{VV}(s)$  and  $1 + 2G_2\Pi_T^{AA}(s)$  of Eqs. (3.22) and (3.25) each develop an *additional* real root on the physical sheet at space-like  $q^2$ , corresponding to a Landau ghost [18] and as shown in Fig. 12, i.e.

$$1 + 2G_2\Pi_T^{VV}(-M_{\rho g}^2) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad 1 + 2G_2\Pi_T^{AA}(-M_{a_1 g}^2) = 0. \quad (3.26)$$

We remark in passing that the same is true of the unbarred combination  $1 - 2G_1\hat{\Pi}^{PP}(s)$  that determines the pion pole. Thus the associated  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  propagators, as well as the pion propagator, contain Landau ghosts if the polarization functions are left unbarred. For the standard parameter set, the vector ghost poles occur at the nearly degenerate positions  $s_{\rho g} = -18.30(4m^2) = -5.11 \text{ GeV}^2$  and  $s_{a_1 g} = -18.04(4m^2) = -5.05 \text{ GeV}^2$ . The pion ghost occurs at  $s_{\pi g} = -13.48(4m^2) = -3.77 \text{ GeV}^2$ . The magnitudes of the ghost poles are always of  $\mathcal{O}(4\Lambda^2)$ .

## 2. Pole approximations for the vector and axial form factors

In order to understand the connection between the poles of the form factors and the peaks in the spectral densities, we now approximate the former by single pole approximations and compare the results with the exact form factors. Their single pole approximations are given by

$$F_V(s) \approx \frac{R_\rho}{(s - s_\rho)}, \quad G_A(s) \approx \frac{R_{a_1}}{(s - s_{a_1})},$$

with residues  $R_\rho = [2G_2\Pi^{(')VV}(s_\rho)]^{-1}$  and  $R_{a_1} = [2G_2\Pi^{(')AA}(s_{a_1})]^{-1}$ . The prime indicates the derivative with respect to  $s$  of the analytically continued polarization function. Here

$s_\rho$  can be either the virtual bound state pole, or the complex pole of the  $\rho$  propagator. In principle, both poles influence the shape of the spectral function, and  $F_V(s)$  should be displayed as the sum of the contributions coming from these two  $\rho$  poles: the mass of the  $\rho$  is not uniquely determined by either one. However, the virtual pole, which for our parameter set lies at  $s_\rho = 0.166(4m^2)$ , is not close enough to the branch point at  $4m^2$  to exert a strong influence on  $F_V(s)$ , so that one expects the complex  $\rho$  pole to dominate in the present situation. One should emphasize, however, that this circumstance is parameter-dependent: a virtual bound state just below  $4m^2$  could have a dominant influence on the vector strength function. The residues themselves are complex numbers with moduli  $|R_\rho| = 0.75 \text{ GeV}^2$  and  $|R_{a_1}| = 0.64 \text{ GeV}^2$  for the standard parameter set.

A comparison between the modulus squared of the exact form factors and their approximations using only the complex  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  poles is presented in Figs. 13 and 14. The form factors  $|F_V(s)|^2$  and  $|G_A(s)|^2$  are faithfully reproduced by their single complex pole approximations for our parameter set. The resultant discrepancies between the peak positions in the spectral densities of Fig. 4 and the pole positions in  $F_V(s)$  and  $G_A(s)$  are shown in Table V. These come, not surprisingly, from the distortion introduced by the kinematic threshold behavior of the one-loop densities  $\rho_1^{(0)V}$  and  $\rho_1^{(0)A}$ . These factors act multiplicatively to force the spectral densities to vanish at the  $\bar{q}q$  threshold, and thus move what would have been a pole peak to somewhat higher energies. This is particularly the case for the  $\rho$  resonance pole since, as seen in Fig. 13, its real part is “invisible” below the branch point. In fact, if one ignores the threshold behavior of the one-loop densities as a first approximation, they become proportional to  $s$  and would produce peaks in the spectral densities at the moduli of the pole positions  $|s_\rho|$  and  $|s_{a_1}|$ . Using the energies given in Table V, one obtains the estimates  $\sqrt{|s_\rho|} = 0.63 \text{ GeV}$  and  $\sqrt{|s_{a_1}|} = 0.93 \text{ GeV}$ , to be compared with the spectral density peak positions at  $0.71 \text{ GeV}$  and  $1.03 \text{ GeV}$ .

## B. Weinberg sum rules

We now investigate the validity of Weinberg’s two sum rules for the ENJL generated spectral densities. Taking the difference  $\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s)$  directly from Eq. (3.15) minus Eq. (3.16), one finds that

$$\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \text{Im} \left[ \frac{\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s) - \bar{\Pi}_T^{AA}(s)}{(1 + 2G_2 \bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s))(1 + 2G_2 \bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s))} \right] \quad (3.27)$$

or

$$\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s) = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} [f_\pi^2 \bar{F}_P(s) \bar{F}_V(s) \bar{F}_A(s)]. \quad (3.28)$$

in view of the Ward identity Eq. (2.37) plus the expressions in Eqs. (2.88) and (2.86) for the vector and axial vector quark form factors  $F_V$  and  $F_A$ . Notice that the *renormalized* pion decay constant  $f_\pi^2 = g_A f_p^2$  of Eq. (2.79) appears quite naturally in this result. The inverse moment integrals of this difference that are required for investigating Weinberg's sum rules can be evaluated in closed form using the methods of contour integration. Their evaluation depends on the fact that the barred amplitudes in

$$f(s) = f_\pi^2 \bar{F}_P(s) \bar{F}_V(s) \bar{F}_A(s) \quad (3.29)$$

that have been constructed using barred polarization functions, are all analytic functions of  $s$  in the cut plane, with the cut extending along the real axis from  $4m^2$  to  $\infty$ . This is so because the poles of the vector and axial form factors only occur on the second sheet, and  $F_P(s)$  has no poles. Hence the integrals of  $f(s)/s$  and  $f(s)$  taken around any closed contour  $\mathcal{C}$  on the first or physical sheet that excludes the cut (and the pole at  $s = 0$  in the first case) are zero. We break up the closed contour into  $\mathcal{C} = C_0 + C_\infty$  as shown in Fig. 15, where  $C_0$  is indented to exclude the cut plus any poles as necessary, and is closed by the contour  $C_\infty$  at infinity. Then the vanishing of the contour integrals of  $f(s)/s$  and  $f(s)$  leads to the relations

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{4m^2}^{\infty} \frac{ds}{s} \text{Im}[f(s + i\epsilon)] = f(0) - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{C_\infty} \frac{ds}{s} f(s) \quad (3.30)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{4m^2}^{\infty} ds \text{Im}[f(s + i\epsilon)] = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{C_\infty} ds f(s) \quad (3.31)$$

for the integrals involving  $\text{Im}[f(s + i\epsilon)]$  taken along the upper lip of the cut. From Eq. (3.28), it is clear that the left hand sides of these two relations are exactly the integrals that we need for the two Weinberg sum rules. In the first case,  $f(0) = f_\pi^2 \bar{F}_P(0) \bar{F}_V(0) \bar{F}_A(0) = f_\pi^2$  from the definition of  $f(s)$  and the normalization of the three form factors. Moreover,

$$f(s) \rightarrow \frac{m \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle}{s}, \quad |s| \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.32)$$

according to Eq. (A36), coupled with the information from Table VI that  $\bar{F}_V(s), \bar{G}_A(s) \rightarrow 1$  asymptotically. Hence the contour integral along the great circle will not contribute in the first case, but does so for the second, since the asymptotic form of  $f(s)$  shows that there is a pole at infinity on  $C_\infty$  of residue  $m \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle$ . Consequently

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s)) = f_\pi^2, \quad (\text{ENJL}) \quad (3.33)$$



$$\int_0^\infty ds(\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s)) = -m\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle \neq 0, \quad (\text{ENJL}). \quad (3.34)$$

Thus the first sum rule is satisfied exactly by the spectral densities that have been obtained by PV-regulating the one-loop densities with the concomitant introduction of negative spectral density at high  $s$ ; the second sum rule again assumes a modified form.

As has already been remarked, the ENJL spectral densities become well-behaved asymptotically if one replaces the one-loop densities in Eqs. (3.15) and (3.16) by their unregulated versions. This is equivalent to removing the bars on the form factors in Eq. (3.29), which changes the asymptotic behavior of  $f(s)$  from what it was in Eq. (3.32) to

$$f(s) \rightarrow -\frac{1}{s^2} \frac{1}{\ln(-s)}, \quad |s| \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.35)$$

according to Table VI. This is sufficiently convergent to prevent the contour integrals along  $C_\infty$  from giving any contribution to either sum rule. However this comes at a price: now both the vector and axial vector form factors have developed ghost poles at space-like  $s$  that bring in contributions of their own, and both of the above sum rules will be modified<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>This immediately begs the question of by how much. The answer to this question depends on what one chooses to understand by “spectral density”. If we simply mean the unregulated versions of Eqs. (3.15) and (3.16), then

$$\int_{4m^2}^\infty \frac{ds}{s} (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s))_{unreg} = f_\pi^2 + R_{\rho g} + R_{a_1 g} = 0.96 f_\pi^2,$$

either via contour integration, or simply by direct numerical integration, where  $R_{\rho g}$  and  $R_{a_1 g}$  are the residues of the function  $f(s)/s$  of Eq.(3.29) at the two ghost poles at  $s = -M_{\rho g}^2$  and  $-M_{a_1 g}^2$ . Thus the unregulated densities, which as we have remarked always remain positive definite, saturate 96% of Weinberg’s first sum rule for our parameter set. This equation is, however, open to an alternative interpretation. Writing the unbarred version of  $f(s)$  in Eq. (3.29) in the equivalent form

$$f(s) = \frac{1}{8G_2} \left[ \frac{1}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{VV}(s)} - \frac{1}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{AA}(s)} \right] \approx \frac{C_{\rho g}}{s + M_{\rho g}^2} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{-C_{a_1 g}}{s + M_{a_1 g}^2},$$

where  $C_{\rho g} = \{16G_2^2 [\partial \Pi_T^{VV}/\partial s]_{-M_{\rho g}^2}\}^{-1} = 0.0648 \text{ GeV}^4$  and  $C_{a_1 g} = \{16G_2^2 [\partial \Pi_T^{AA}/\partial s]_{-M_{a_1 g}^2}\}^{-1} = 0.0623 \text{ GeV}^4$  are the spectral strengths of the ghost modes, the residues  $R_{\rho g}$  and  $R_{a_1 g}$  of  $f(s)/s$  are  $-C_{\rho g} M_{\rho g}^{-2}$  and  $C_{a_1 g} M_{a_1 g}^{-2}$ . The spectral densities themselves are  $\delta$ -function distributions at space-like  $s$  of negative strength,

$$\rho_1^V(s)_{ghost} = -C_{\rho g} \delta(s + M_{\rho g}^2) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_1^A(s)_{ghost} = -C_{a_1 g} \delta(s + M_{a_1 g}^2)$$

by these ghost modes. Thus the unregulated ENJL densities that are otherwise physically well-behaved have introduced different unphysical elements into the sum rules again by a different route.

### C. Gasser-Leutwyler sum rules

The remaining sum rules can be evaluated by the same method. We start with the Gasser-Leutwyler sum rule in Eq. (3.7a). This has a double pole at the origin, so that the derivative  $f'(0)$  of  $f(s)$  at the origin appears on the right hand side of Eq. (3.30) instead of  $f(0)$ . There is also no contribution from  $C_\infty$ . Thus

$$\int_{4m^2}^{\infty} \frac{ds}{s^2} (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s)) = f_\pi^2 [\bar{F}'_P(0) + \bar{F}'_V(0) + \bar{F}'_A(0)], \quad (3.36)$$

where the primes indicate the derivatives of the form factors. Straightforward calculations yield

---

if we assume the standard  $(-M_g^2) - i\epsilon$  prescription for ghost poles too. Then, by transferring the residue contributions from the right hand to the left hand side of the sum rule and including them under the integral, the sum rule may be rewritten in the equivalent form

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{ds}{s} (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s))_{ghosts+unreg} = f_\pi^2$$

so that the sum rule violation is uniquely attributable to the presence of the ghosts. Exactly the same arguments yield

$$\int_{4m^2}^{\infty} ds (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s))_{unreg} = C_{\rho g} - C_{a_1 g} = (224 \text{ MeV})^4$$

or

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} ds (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s))_{ghosts+unreg} = 0$$

for the second sum rule, since  $C_{\rho g} - C_{a_1 g}$  is just the negative of the *sum* of the residues at the two ghost poles,  $f(M_{\rho g}^2) = C_{\rho g}$  and  $f(-M_{a_1 g}^2) = -C_{a_1 g}$ , where  $f(s)$  is the product in Eq. (3.29), and there is still no contribution from the contour  $C_\infty$  at infinity. Thus if one widens the definition of spectral density to admit contributions from the ghost modes, both forms of Weinberg's sum rules are recovered without modification. These results suggest that the unphysical ghosts represent a legitimate part of the meson mode spectrum of the *model* propagators when subtracted dispersion relations are used to construct them.

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{F}'_P(0) &= \frac{g_A}{8\pi^2 f_\pi^2} [1 + O(m^2/\Lambda^2)] \\
\bar{F}'_V(0) &= \frac{1}{6m^2} \left( \frac{1 - g_A}{g_A} \right) \\
\bar{F}'_A(0) &= \frac{1}{6m^2} (1 - g_A) - \frac{g_A}{8\pi^2 f_\pi^2} (1 - g_A) [1 + O(m^2/\Lambda^2)],
\end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

leading to<sup>14</sup>

$$\int_{4m^2}^{\infty} \frac{ds}{s^2} (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s)) = \frac{g_A^2}{8\pi^2} + \frac{f_\pi^2}{6m^2} \left( \frac{1 - g_A^2}{g_A} \right), \tag{3.38}$$

after setting  $8G_2 f_\pi^2 = 1 - g_A$  again, and dropping the inconsequential  $\mathcal{O}(m^2/\Lambda^2)$  correction to  $F'_P(0)$  that appears through the explicit cutoff dependence of the pion radius parameter in Eq. (A40). On comparing with Eq. (3.7a), one identifies the ENJL value for  $\bar{l}_5$  from the expression

$$\bar{l}_5^{ENJL} + \ln(m_\pi^2/\mu^2) = 1 + 6g_A^2 + 8\pi^2 \frac{f_\pi^2}{m^2} \left( \frac{1 - g_A^2}{g_A} \right), \tag{3.39}$$

after adding in the chiral logarithm as in Eq.(2.118) again. Then one finds  $\bar{l}_5^{ENJL} = 12.8$  for the standard parameter set. The empirical value is  $\bar{l}_5 = 13.9 \pm 1.3$  [5].

Similar arguments suffice for checking the next sum rule, Eq. (3.7b), except that here we have to include non-chiral effects to order  $\mathcal{O}(\hat{m})$  in the calculation of  $\rho_0^A = (1/4\pi) \text{Im} \tilde{\Pi}_{L;nc}^{AA}$  from  $\tilde{\Pi}_{L;nc}^{AA}$  of Eq. (2.94). Note that  $\tilde{\Pi}_{L;nc}^{AA}$  has acquired a pole at the physical pion mass due to explicit chiral symmetry-breaking by the current quark mass. The behavior of  $(1/4)\tilde{\Pi}_{L;nc}^{AA}$  and the contribution to the spectral density in the vicinity of the pion pole at  $s = m_\pi^2 + \mathcal{O}(\hat{m}^2)$  are

$$\frac{1}{4} \tilde{\Pi}_{L;nc}^{AA} \approx \frac{-C_{a_L}}{s - m_\pi^2 + i\epsilon}; \quad \rho_0^A(s)_{\pi \text{ pole}} = C_{a_L} \delta(s - m_\pi^2), \quad C_{a_L} = f_\pi^2 m_\pi^2, \tag{3.40}$$

while the behavior on  $C_\infty$  is

$$\frac{1}{4} \tilde{\Pi}_{L;nc}^{AA} \approx \frac{\hat{m}}{m} f_p^2 \bar{F}_P(s) \approx \frac{\hat{m} \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle}{s} = -\frac{m_\pi^2 f_\pi^2}{s}, \quad |s| \rightarrow \infty. \tag{3.41}$$

In obtaining these results, we have used the Goldberger-Treiman and GMOR relations, Eqs. (2.80) and (2.102), that are satisfied by the ENJL coupling constants and pion mass,

---

<sup>14</sup>Since the ghost poles are so massive, using unregulated densities in this case would add a completely negligible contribution of  $C_{\rho g} M_{\rho g}^{-4} - C_{a1g} M_{a1g}^{-4} \sim 10^{-5}$  to the right hand side.

plus the information provided in Table VI. The pion ghost pole depicted in Fig. 12 does not occur, since we are using barred polarization amplitudes.

We also need the residue of  $(1/4s^2)\tilde{\Pi}_{L;nc}^{AA}$  at the double pole at  $s^2 = 0$ . A short calculation gives this residue as

$$\left\{\frac{d}{ds}\frac{1}{4}\tilde{\Pi}_{L;nc}^{AA}\right\}_{s=0} = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} + \frac{1}{m_\pi^2}\frac{f_\pi^4(0)}{f_\pi^2(m_\pi^2)} \approx \frac{1}{8\pi^2} + \frac{f_\pi^2}{m_\pi^2}\left(1 - \frac{m_\pi^2}{8\pi^2 f_\pi^2} + \dots\right) = \frac{f_\pi^2}{m_\pi^2}, \quad (3.42)$$

after using the defining equation (2.117) for the pion mass up to order  $\mathcal{O}(\hat{m}^2)$ . Deforming the contour in Fig. 15 so that the pion pole on the real axis at  $s = m_\pi^2 < 4m^2$  is also excluded, one finds

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s^2} \rho_0^A(s) = \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s^2} (\rho_0^A(s)_{\pi pole} + \rho_0^A(s)_{cut}) = \frac{C_{a_L}}{m_\pi^4} + \left\{\frac{f_\pi^2}{m_\pi^2} + \frac{-C_{a_L}}{m_\pi^4}\right\} = \frac{f_\pi^2}{m_\pi^2} \quad (3.43)$$

there being no contribution along  $C_\infty$  in view of Eq. (3.41). We notice that the sum rule is saturated by the pion pole strength alone: the contribution (in curly brackets) to the integrated spectral density along the cut vanishes. This just reflects the fact that the PV-regulated longitudinal axial density of the ENJL model again includes exactly the correct amount of negative density at large  $s$  for this sum rule to be obeyed.

The sum rules that involve the isoscalar-scalar minus isovector-pseudoscalar and isovector-scalar minus isoscalar-pseudoscalar densities depend on the analytic behavior of the polarization differences

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{nc}^{S_0 S_0}(s) - \tilde{\Pi}_{nc}^{PP}(s) = \frac{\bar{\Pi}_{nc}^{S_0 S_0}(s) - \bar{\Pi}_{nc}^{PP}(s)}{(1 - 2G_1 \bar{\Pi}_{nc}^{S_0 S_0}(s))(1 - 2G_1 \bar{\Pi}_{nc}^{PP}(s))} \approx -4f_p^2 \bar{F}_P(s), \quad |s| \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.44)$$

obtained from constructing Eq. (2.27) minus Eq. (2.91) and

$$\bar{\Pi}_{nc}^{SS}(s) - \bar{\Pi}_{nc}^{P_0 P_0}(s) = -4f_p^2 \bar{F}_P(s), \quad (3.45)$$

on subtracting the Eq. (2.30a) from Eq. (2.30c). This is done after formally upgrading the proper polarizations to include non-chiral contributions too. As these effects will actually fall away to the order to which we are working, this upgrading is inessential, *except* for  $\Pi_{nc}^{PP}$ . One notes that both differences behave asymptotically in the same way as the axial vector minus vector polarization of Eq. (2.35). Explicit forms of the proper polarizations appearing in these expressions have been given previously:  $\Pi^{P_0 P_0}$  in Eq. (2.30a),  $\Pi^{S_0 S_0} = \Pi^{SS}$  in Eq. (2.30c), and  $\tilde{\Pi}_{nc}^{PP}$  in Eq. (2.90).

In contrast to Eq. (3.45), the difference in Eq. (3.44) contains poles at  $s = m_\sigma^2 = 4m^2 + \mathcal{O}(\hat{m})$  and  $s = m_\pi^2 + \mathcal{O}(\hat{m}^2)$ , given by the zeros of the two denominators, that determine the masses of the  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  meson modes. This structure comes about from summing all proper polarization diagrams linked by the interactions that are present in the isoscalar and isovector channels, a mechanism that is absent in Eq. (3.45). The residues at these poles are given by the negatives  $-C_\sigma$  and  $-C_\pi$  of their spectral strengths in the usual way:

$$\rho^S(s)_{\sigma pole} = C_\sigma \delta(s - m_\sigma^2), \quad C_\sigma = \frac{g_{\sigma qq}^2}{4G_1^2} \quad (3.46)$$

$$\rho^P(s)_{\pi pole} = C_\pi \delta(s - m_\pi^2), \quad C_\pi = \frac{g_{\pi qq}^2}{4G_1^2}. \quad (3.47)$$

The sum rules that are still outstanding now follow without difficulty: for sum rule (3.8a), only the residue of the integrand at zero contributes to the contour in Fig. 15 (that is suitably indented to avoid both the  $\sigma$  and the  $\pi$  poles), since the residues at these poles just cancel against the contributions from  $\rho^S(s)_{\sigma pole}$  and  $\rho^P(s)_{\pi pole}$ , and there is no contribution along  $C_\infty$ . The same remarks hold for evaluating the sum rule (3.8b), except that the meson poles are absent. The contribution of the full scalar polarization  $\tilde{\Pi}^{S_0 S_0}$  to the residue in the first case is always of order  $\hat{m}^2 \tilde{\Pi}^{S_0 S_0}(0) \sim \mathcal{O}(\hat{m}^2)$ , and can thus be neglected to the order  $\mathcal{O}(\hat{m})$  to which we are working. By contrast, the pseudoscalar piece already contributes at the  $\mathcal{O}(\hat{m})$  level,  $\hat{m}^2 \tilde{\Pi}^{PP}(0) \sim \mathcal{O}(\hat{m})$ . This difference arises due to the special nature of the quasi-chiral pion mode (mass)<sup>2</sup> which itself vanishes linearly with  $\hat{m}$ , while the sigma mode (mass)<sup>2</sup> approaches a constant. Thus

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \hat{m}^2 (\rho^S(s) - \rho^P(s)) = \hat{m}^2 \tilde{\Pi}^{S_0 S_0}(0) - \frac{\hat{m}m}{2G_1} (1 - \frac{\hat{m}}{m}) = -f_\pi^2 m_\pi^2 + \mathcal{O}(\hat{m}^2), \quad (3.48)$$

where the last step follows from GMOR. There is also a much more direct way of evaluating this sum rule using the relation

$$\rho_0^A(s) = \frac{\hat{m}^2}{s} \rho^P(s), \quad (3.49)$$

that is readily established from the definitions of  $\rho_0^A$  and  $\rho^P(s)$ . One then finds that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \hat{m}^2 \rho^P(s) &= \int_0^\infty ds (\rho_0^A(s)_{\pi pole} + \rho_0^A(s)_{cut}) \\ &= C_{a_L} + \{-C_{a_L} + m_\pi^2 f_\pi^2\} = m_\pi^2 f_\pi^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.50)$$

after noticing that there *is* a contribution from the contour  $C_\infty$  in this case, in view of Eq. (3.41) that just cancels against the residue of  $(1/4)\tilde{\Pi}_{L;inc}^{AA}$  at the pion pole it contains.

Thus the contribution of the integral along the cut (in curly brackets) is zero, the entire integrated strength being determined by the pion pole in this way of calculating the integral. Taking the negative of this result and dropping the scalar density contribution for the same reason as before, we regain the sum rule (3.48).

Exactly the same arguments hold for obtaining the sum rule in (3.8b). Since there are no meson poles in this case, the value of the integral is given by

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \hat{m}^2 (\tilde{\rho}^S(s) - \tilde{\rho}^P(s)) = -4\hat{m}^2 f_p^2 \bar{F}_P(0) = -4\hat{m}^2 f_p^2. \quad (3.51)$$

Equating this with  $-2m_\pi^4 l_7$  in conformity with Eq. (3.8b) in order to define  $l_7$ , we have

$$l_7 = \frac{2\hat{m}^2 f_p^2}{m_\pi^4} \sim (0.5 \text{ to } 1.4) \times 10^{-3}, \quad (3.52)$$

depending on whether the ENJL or NJL parameters are used from Table I. We have used the GMOR relation to fix  $\hat{m}$  at 3.0MeV or 4.5MeV respectively, taking  $m_\pi = 135\text{MeV}$ . The empirical value is  $\sim 5 \times 10^{-3}$  [5]. Finally,

$$\int_0^\infty ds (\rho^S(s) - \rho^P(s)) = (C_\sigma - C_\pi) + \{ -C_\sigma + C_\pi + 4m\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle \} = 4m\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle \quad (3.53)$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty ds (\tilde{\rho}^S(s) - \tilde{\rho}^P(s)) = 4m\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle, \quad (3.54)$$

using by now familiar arguments. Note that there is a contribution to both integrals coming from the contour  $C_\infty$  that in fact determines their common value.

In summary, we have extended the previous study [17] by showing that all eight sum rules of interest to chiral perturbation theory are obeyed by the PV regulated ENJL spectral densities, except for modifications to the three zero moment sum rules that assume a value proportional to  $m\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle$  instead of zero. Since the values of these sum rules only involve combinations of  $f_\pi$  and  $m_\pi$ , they continue to be obeyed (with  $f_\pi \rightarrow f_p$  and  $m_\pi \rightarrow m_p$ ) by the PV-regulated NJL spectral densities, which do not contain resonances of any kind from the  $\rho - a_1$  sector. Thus, while the vector and axial vector modes produce resonant spectral density functions, such resonances are not a prerequisite for the sum rules to hold. We also comment on the modifications of the zero moment sum rules that occurred in Eqs. (3.12), (3.34), (3.53) and (3.54). Possible modifications of the original form of Weinberg's sum rules, Eqs. (3.2a) and (3.2b), have been investigated by Nieh and Jackiw [47], who developed criteria for obtaining these sum rules from a specific Hamiltonian. This in turn leads to the speculation (that remains to be explored along the lines of the Nieh-Jackiw approach for

example) that the modifications found here might perhaps be examples of a more general property associated with the *dynamical* breaking of chiral symmetry with mass generation in the groundstate, and which would hold for any Hamiltonian that energetically favors the formation of a finite condensate.

## IV. SUM RULES AND THE ELECTROMAGNETIC PROPERTIES OF THE PION

### A. Pion electromagnetic form factor, radius, and polarizability

#### 1. Form factor and pion radius

The electromagnetic form factor,  $F_\pi(q^2)$ , of the pion is given diagrammatically by Fig. 16. The diagram includes the  $\rho^0$  exchange renormalization of the isovector component of the quark electromagnetic current as in Fig. 1. This modifies the  $\gamma qq$  vertex, shown as an open circle, as follows,

$$-ieJ_\mu^{(em)} = -ie\left(\frac{1}{3}J_\mu^0 + J_\mu^3\right) \rightarrow -ie[e_q\gamma_\mu + \frac{1}{i}\Pi_T^{VV}(q^2)\frac{1}{i}D_T^{VV}(q^2)T_{\mu\nu}\frac{\tau_3}{2}\gamma^\nu]. \quad (4.1)$$

The charge carried by the quarks has been denoted by  $e_q = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{3} + \tau_3)$ , in units of  $e$ . The corresponding analytical expression for  $F_\pi(q^2)$  has been derived as Eq. (A74) in Appendix A, section 5:

$$F_\pi(q^2) = \left\{g_A F_P(q^2) + (1 - g_A) + (1 - g_A)^2 \frac{1}{8f_\pi^2} \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2)\right\} F_V(q^2). \quad (4.2)$$

If the composite structure of the Goldstone  $\pi$  meson is suppressed by setting the contents of the curly brackets to unity, one obtains the vector dominance model form:  $F_\pi(q^2) \approx F_V(q^2)$ . On the other hand, setting  $g_A = 1$  returns one to the NJL expression  $F_P(q^2)$  for the form factor. The pion charge radius is identified from the low  $q^2$  behavior of  $F_\pi(q^2)$ :

$$F_\pi(q^2) = 1 + q^2 \left[ \frac{g_A^2}{8\pi^2 f_\pi^2} - \frac{(1 - g_A)^2}{12g_A m^2} + \frac{1}{m_V^2} \right] + \dots = 1 + \frac{1}{6} q^2 \langle r_\pi^2 \rangle + \dots \quad (4.3)$$

The contribution from the derivative of the vector form factor to this expression has been displayed separately as

$$F_V'(0) = (1 - g_A)/6g_A m^2 = 1/m_V^2, \quad (4.4)$$

to show that it has exactly the structure of the vector dominance model when expressed in terms of the  $\rho$  meson mass  $m_V$  as given by the low energy expansion of the ENJL model. We thus obtain the following expression for the charge radius of a chiral pion,

$$\langle r_\pi^2 \rangle = \frac{3g_A^2}{4\pi^2 f_\pi^2} + \frac{(1 - g_A^2)}{2g_A m^2} = \frac{1}{16\pi^2 f_\pi^2} (\bar{l}_6 - 1). \quad (4.5)$$

For  $g_A = 1$ , this reduces to Tarrach's expression [48] for  $\langle r_\pi^2 \rangle$ . We have introduced the definition of the  $\bar{l}_6$  CHPT coupling parameter in the last step. As a case in point, we remark that inclusion of the leading order non-chiral contributions to  $F_\pi(q^2)$  would add a chiral logarithm of the form [20]

$$- \frac{1}{16\pi^2 f_\pi^2} \ln(m_\pi^2/4m^2) \quad (4.6)$$

to the middle term of the above expression for  $\langle r_\pi^2 \rangle$ . This term, which arises from the leading non-chiral contribution of the dumbbell diagrams to  $F_\pi(q^2)$ , has exactly the correct coefficient to combine with  $\bar{l}_6$  to give the prediction

$$\bar{l}_6 + \ln(m_\pi^2/\mu^2) = 1 + 12g_A^2 + 8\pi^2 \frac{f_\pi^2}{m^2} \left( \frac{1 - g_A^2}{g_A} \right) \quad (4.7)$$

at the scale  $\mu = 2m$ . The right hand side of this equation gives the ENJL value for the renormalized coupling constant  $l_6^r$  up to a conversion factor [5]. However, there is no need to include this factor to compute  $l_6^r$ , since  $\bar{l}_6$  is the physically interesting quantity and this may now be computed directly. Numerically, the calculated radius comes to  $0.36 \text{ fm}^2$  for our standard parameter set, and leads to the value  $\bar{l}_6 = 16.2$ . The experimental value is  $\langle r_\pi^2 \rangle = 0.44 \pm 0.03 \text{ fm}^2$  [49,50], which in turn leads to the empirical value  $\bar{l}_6 = 16.5 \pm 1.1$ .

The behavior of the ENJL form factor is compared with the experimental data [51] for  $|F_\pi(q^2)|^2$  in Fig. 17 at both space-like and time-like  $q^2$ . Given that no parameters have been re-adjusted, one notes that the overall agreement is fair. Thus is particularly true at small space-like  $q^2$  where the behavior is quantitatively the same as the CHPT prediction [52] (which, however, uses the experimental pion radius as input). This agreement simply reflects the reasonable value of  $\langle r_\pi^2 \rangle = 0.36 \text{ fm}^2$  for the ENJL prediction of the pion radius. For larger  $q^2$ , and more especially in the time-like region, the same comments as were made in connection with the continuum structure of the vector and axial vector spectral densities should be borne in mind here too: The continuum behavior of the calculated  $|F_\pi|^2$  for  $q^2 \geq 4m^2$  in Fig. 17 is determined by the  $\bar{q}q$  decay channel, not the physically expected  $\rho \rightarrow \pi\pi$  channel. Thus the ENJL form factor embraces contributions in the time-like region from a decay channel that would not be available in a confining theory.

## 2. Polarizability of charged pions.

Using the current algebra sum rule of Das, Mathur and Okubo [53] for the axial structure constant that enters into the  $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$  radiative decay matrix element, Holstein has derived



the following expression for the electric polarizability  $\alpha_E$  of charged pions [22]:

$$\alpha_E = \frac{\alpha}{3m_\pi} \langle r_\pi^2 \rangle - \frac{\alpha}{m_\pi f_\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s^2} (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s)). \quad (4.8)$$

The first term corresponds to the “classical” contribution from a charged particle of radius squared  $\langle r_\pi^2 \rangle$  [54]. Taking the pion radius squared from the Eq. (4.5) and the value of the integral from Eq. (3.38), one obtains (we express the result directly in terms of the ENJL  $\bar{l}_i$ s, and take their difference from Table II)

$$\alpha_E = \frac{\alpha}{m_\pi} \frac{1}{48\pi^2 f_\pi^2} (\bar{l}_6^{ENJL} - \bar{l}_5^{ENJL}) = \frac{g_A^2}{8\pi^2 f_\pi^2} \frac{\alpha}{m_\pi} = 3.4 \times 10^{-4} \text{ fm}^3, \quad (4.9)$$

if  $g_A = 0.75$ . In computing the numerical result in Eq. (4.9), we have also used  $m_\pi = 135 \text{ MeV}$  and  $f_\pi = 93 \text{ MeV}$  in addition to  $\alpha \approx 1/137$  as input.

The first expression coincides exactly with the form of the result for  $\alpha_E$  that is obtained by treating the forward scattering of soft photons by pions in chiral perturbation theory at the one-loop level [23]. There are three additional noteworthy features about this expression: (i) since the radius contribution and the contribution from the integral over the density functions occur with exactly the same numerical coefficient when expressed in terms of the chiral coupling constants, all factors common to both  $\bar{l}_6$  and  $\bar{l}_5$  cancel in the difference. This feature leads to a complete cancellation of the contribution from the  $\rho$  meson degrees of freedom, a feature that has also been obtained by Holstein [22] via another method, that of saturating the sum rule with delta function distributions in conjunction with the KSFRF relation. (ii) the quark mass  $m$  has fallen away due to this cancellation, and (iii) the quenching effect of the  $a_1$  meson degree of freedom only enters via the axial form factor  $g_A$ . Thus Eq. (4.9) is a *prediction* of the ENJL model that only contains physical quantities that are known in principle. In particular, it is a prediction for an upper limit on  $\alpha_E$ ,

$$\alpha_E \leq \frac{\alpha}{8\pi^2 f_\pi^2} \frac{1}{m_\pi} \approx 6 \times 10^{-4} \text{ fm}^3. \quad (4.10)$$

The result (4.9), and the upper limit in particular, can be compared directly with the prediction of chiral perturbation theory at one loop that uses the empirical values of the coupling constants  $\bar{l}_5$  and  $\bar{l}_6$  to obtain [22,23]

$$\alpha_E^{chpt} = \frac{\alpha}{m_\pi} \frac{1}{48\pi^2 f_\pi^2} (\bar{l}_6 - \bar{l}_5) = 2.7 \times 10^{-4} \text{ fm}^3 \quad (4.11)$$

for the polarizability of the charged pion. One can also compare our result with the estimate  $\alpha_E = (5.6 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-4} \text{ fm}^3$  that has been obtained from Eq. (4.8) by using the experimental

pion radius as input, and estimating the integral involving the vector and axial vector densities using QCD sum rule methods [55].

The experimental value of  $\alpha_E$  is still very poorly known. The data analysis for the combinations  $\alpha_E \pm \beta_M$ , where  $\beta_M$  is the magnetic polarizability, yields values for  $\alpha_E$  from  $2.2 \pm 1.6$  [24,25] through  $6.8 \pm 1.4$  [26] to  $20 \pm 12$  [27], in units of  $10^{-4} \text{ fm}^3$ . In addition, these numbers depend somewhat on whether the constraint of good chiral symmetry [56]  $\alpha_E + \beta_M = 0$  is implemented or not. Thus one may conclude that the chiral perturbation theory prediction and the ENJL model sum rule prediction agree qualitatively with each other, and that neither result agrees with the experimental data to date. We refer to [28] for an overview of the present state of experiment and comparison with theoretical calculations.

## B. Pion electromagnetic mass difference

In a historically important paper from the point of view of current algebra techniques, Das, Guralnik, Mathur, Low and Young [29] exploited Weinberg's two sum rules, Eqs. (3.2a) and (3.2b) for massless QCD to obtain an expression for the pion electromagnetic mass difference in terms of vector and axial vector spectral densities. These authors showed that the mass squared difference between the charged and uncharged chiral pions (therefore having common rest mass zero) may be written in the form

$$\Delta m_\pi^2 = m_{\pi^\pm}^2 - m_{\pi^0}^2 = 3ie^2 f_\pi^{-2} \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{q^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s - q^2} (\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s)), \quad (4.12)$$

to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$  in the electromagnetic coupling  $\alpha = e^2/4\pi \approx 1/137$ . By saturating the Weinberg sum rules with low-lying vector and axial vector mesons, they obtained the estimate  $\Delta m_\pi^2 \approx (3\alpha/2\pi)m_\rho^2 \ln(m_{a_1}^2/m_\rho^2) = (37.85\text{MeV})^2$  in terms of the  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  meson masses, taking  $m_\rho = 770\text{MeV}$  and the Weinberg ratio  $m_{a_1} = \sqrt{2}m_\rho$  for the  $a_1$  mass. The current experimental value is  $\Delta m_\pi^2 = 1261\text{MeV}^2 = (35.51\text{MeV})^2$ . This calculation represented one of the first successful applications of QCD sum rules.

By contrast, the ENJL expression for the spectral density difference appearing in Eq. (3.28) allows us to evaluate the Das *et al.* expression without making any further assumptions as to the resonance content of the spectral density functions. Since, according to Eq. (3.30), the required integral over  $s$  is given by the residue  $f(s)$  at  $q^2$  instead of zero, where  $f(s) = f_\pi^2 \bar{F}_P(s) \bar{F}_V(s) \bar{F}_A(s)$ , one immediately has the result

$$\Delta m_\pi^2 = 3ie^2 \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{q^2} \bar{F}_P(q^2) \bar{F}_V(q^2) \bar{F}_A(q^2). \quad (4.13)$$

A formula essentially equivalent to this expression has also been derived using a QCD effective action approach [13]. Below, we give yet another derivation of this expression using Feynman diagrams. In the limit  $g_A = 1$ , where  $\bar{F}_V$  and  $\bar{F}_A$  are both unity, it reduces to the expression given previously [15] for  $\Delta m_\pi^2$  for the NJL model, while making the *ad hoc* assumption that all the mesons are elementary without internal structure of any kind,  $\bar{F}_P(s) = 1$ ,  $\bar{F}_{V,A} \approx (1 - q^2/m_{\rho,a_1}^2)^{-1}$  leads one back to the Das *et al.* estimate.

Further evaluation of  $\Delta m_\pi^2$  has to be done numerically. However, since the product of PV-regulated form factors in the integrand of Eq. (4.13) goes like  $-1/q^2$  according to Table VI, the integral over the photon momenta diverges logarithmically, and some form of photon momentum cutoff is required. This contrasts with the special case of approximate evaluation by Das *et al.* mentioned above, where the assumption of delta distributions for the vector and axial vector densities that satisfy both Weinberg sum rules guarantees a convergent result. A logarithmic divergence also results when their approach is extended to cover physical (i.e. non-chiral) pions [58].

Performing a Wick rotation to Euclidean photon momenta, one finds

$$\Delta m_\pi^2 = \frac{3\alpha}{4\pi} \int_0^{\lambda_{ph}^2} dQ^2 \bar{F}_P(-Q^2) \bar{F}_V(-Q^2) \bar{F}_A(-Q^2). \quad (4.14)$$

This transformation is permissible since the poles of the integrand all lie on the second Riemann sheet and thus do not interfere with the deformation of the integration contour. The behavior of  $\Delta m_\pi^2$  versus  $\lambda_{ph}^2$  is shown in Fig. 18. A cutoff of  $\lambda_{ph}^2 = (1.27\text{GeV})^2$  leads to the observed value  $\Delta m_\pi^2 = 1261 \text{ MeV}^2$  of this quantity, if we use the standard parameter set of this paper to compute the form factors in Eq. (4.13). This value of the photon momentum cutoff requires some comment. In the  $\mathcal{O}(4)$  regularization scheme (which we do not employ) the Euclidean quark momenta are limited by the cutoff  $\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}(4)}$ , so that the photon momenta are restricted by  $Q^2 \leq 4\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}(4)}^2$  in Eq. (4.14). Since one has the rough equivalence [16]  $\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}(4)}^2 \approx (2 \ln 2)\Lambda^2 \sim (2.5 \text{ GeV})^2$ , this restriction is met by our photon cutoff. Furthermore this cutoff also agrees satisfactorily with the scale  $\mu^2 = (0.95 \text{ GeV})^2$  quoted in [13] at which a smooth matching [57] between Eq. (4.14) (for a different set of input parameters however) and the short distance QCD contribution to  $\Delta m_\pi^2$  can be accomplished.

### C. Derivation via Feynman diagrams

While the derivation of the expression just given for  $\Delta m_\pi^2$  via spectral densities is technically very concise, the underlying physics determining this splitting is less transparent. We remedy this by using the diagram method. One can then verify the ENJL expression

(4.13) for  $\Delta m_\pi^2$  explicitly by identifying the additional set of Feynman diagrams for the pion polarization that include single photons in intermediate states. This method has already been described in [15] for the case of the minimal NJL model. The diagrammatic method offers some advantages over the sum rule approach. The electromagnetic gauge invariance can be made explicit, as well as the consequences of the residual  $U_A(1) \times U_V(1)$  chiral symmetry as expressed by Dashen's theorem [14], that keeps the neutral chiral pion mass at zero in the presence of its own internal electromagnetic field. It confirms that the Das *et al.* formula in conjunction with the ENJL spectral densities is correct to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha N_c)$ . Also, it is straightforward to extend this method to cover physical pions carrying non-zero mass in the absence of the electromagnetic interaction. An attempt to extend the approach of Das *et al.* directly to cover the case of non-zero pion mass is reported in [58].

In order to identify the relevant electromagnetic diagrams for calculating the electromagnetic mass splitting of the pion, we include the electromagnetic interactions via minimal coupling in the ENJL model, and study their effect to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ . The additional diagrams are obtained in the usual way by dressing the skeleton pion polarization diagrams with single photon self-energy and vertex corrections. The diagrammatic calculation of  $\Delta m_\pi^2$  to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$  starts out with the observation that only those diagrams involving the exchange of a single photon that are different in the isovector and isoscalar channels will contribute. This immediately excludes all quark self-energy diagrams in the pion polarization where the photon line dresses either a quark, or an antiquark line. Such diagrams (which are however essential to maintain gauge invariance) contribute equally to the charged and neutral pion channels and thus cancel in the mass difference calculation. They are shown in Fig. 19 for later reference. The diagrams we thus require are of two types: (i) scattering diagrams where the quark-antiquark pair making up the polarization loop interact via photon exchange in intermediate states, and (ii) meson-pole, or “dumbbell” diagrams where the  $\pi + a_L, \rho$  and  $a_1$  meson modes are exchanged together with a photon between two  $\gamma\pi\pi$  vertices. These diagrams are presented in Fig. 20. In addition,  $\rho^0$  exchange causes a renormalization of the isovector component of the quark electromagnetic current as in Eq. (4.1). The modified vertex itself is again indicated as an open circle to which the photon is attached as in Fig. 16.

Both sets of diagrams in Fig. 20 are vertex corrections to the basic one-loop irreducible diagram that determines the pion polarization to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha N_c)$ . At first sight, the appearance of such two-loop diagrams containing mesons in intermediate states is surprising, since they formally contain higher powers in the meson quark coupling constants than the single loop diagram. However they are of the same order  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha N_c)$  as the single loop contribution to the electromagnetic self-energy of the pion, and therefore of  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$  relative to the pion self-

energy in the absence of electromagnetic interactions. This comes about since the meson propagators scale like  $1/N_c$ . This is a special feature arising from the linked nature of the solutions for the quark and meson self-energies in the NJL model.

Let  $\Pi_{EM}^{T_3}(q^2)$  denote the contribution from the sum of diagrams in Fig. 20 in the channel of isospin projection  $T_3$ . Here  $T_3$  equals  $\pm 1$  for  $\pi^\pm$  and 0 for  $\pi^0$ . Then  $\Delta m_\pi^2$  is given by [15]

$$\Delta m_\pi^2 = -g_{\pi qq}^2 \{ \Pi_{EM}^\pm(0) - \Pi_{EM}^0(0) \} \quad (4.15)$$

for chiral pions. Using an extension of the arguments presented in detail in [15], one can again show that this expression is fully gauge invariant. We can thus describe the photon propagation in any convenient gauge. We use the Feynman gauge,

$$-iD_{ph}^{\mu\nu}(q^2) = -i\frac{g^{\mu\nu}}{q^2}. \quad (4.16)$$

The translation of all the Feynman diagrams in Fig. 20 is deferred to Appendix A, section 6. Here we simply summarize the results for the two classes of diagrams:

(i) *Scattering diagrams.* The scattering diagrams give rise to a contribution to the difference (4.15) that is of the form [Eq. (A80)],

$$\begin{aligned} \{ \Pi_{EM}^\pm(0) - \Pi_{EM}^0(0) \}_{scatt} &= -ie^2 \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} F_P(q^2) \\ &\quad - 3ie^2 \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} F_P(q^2) F_V^2(q^2). \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

(ii) *Meson pole, or dumbbell diagrams.* By contrast, the dumbbell diagrams only contribute to the charged channels. There is no contribution for  $T_3 = 0$ , due to the electromagnetic vertices they contain. One finds for the sum of the  $\pi + a_L$  contributions that [Eq. (A88)]

$$\Pi_{EM}^{(\pi+a_L)}(0) = ie^2 \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} F_P(q^2) \quad (4.18)$$

while

$$\Pi_{EM}^{(a_1)}(0) = 3ie^2 \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} \{ F_P(q^2) F_V^2(q^2) \frac{8G_2 f_p^2 F_P(q^2)}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{AA}(q^2)} \} \quad (4.19)$$

gives the contribution from the  $a_1$  dumbbell diagram [Eq. (A94)]. In obtaining the latter result, we have inserted the specific form of the  $a_1$  propagator into Eq. (A94). Finally we note that there is no contribution from the analogous dumbbell diagram with a  $\rho$  meson exchange replacing the  $a_1$  vector meson exchange in the chiral limit. The reason for this is given in more detail in Appendix A.

We now add Eqs. (4.17) through (4.19). The  $\pi + a_L$  dumbbell contribution cancels against a similar term in the scattering contribution, and we are left with a result for the self-energy difference required in Eq. (4.15) that may be written as

$$-g_{\pi qq}^2 \{\Pi_{EM}^\pm(0) - \Pi_{EM}^0(0)\} = 3ig_{\pi qq}^2 e^2 \frac{f^2}{m^2} \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} F_P(q^2) F_V^2(q^2) \left\{ 1 - \frac{8G_2 f_p^2 F_P(q^2)}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{AA}(q^2)} \right\}. \quad (4.20)$$

At first sight, this expression gives the impression that the contributions from the  $\rho^0$  degrees of freedom enter quadratically through the vector form factor  $F_V(q^2)$ . This impression is false. Using the Ward identity of Eq. (2.37) in reverse, one sees that

$$\left\{ 1 - \frac{8G_2 f_p^2 F_P(q^2)}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{AA}(q^2)} \right\} = \frac{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2)}{1 + 2G_2 \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2)} = G_A(q^2)/F_V(q^2). \quad (4.21)$$

Thus one power of  $F_V(q^2)$  is removed. Furthermore, since  $g_{\pi qq}^2 = g_p^2/g_A$ , the strong interaction physics part of the factor in front of the integral becomes  $f_p^2 g_p^2/(m^2 g_A) = 1/g_A$  that supplies precisely the correct factor to convert  $G_A(q^2)$  into the axial form factor  $F_A(q^2) = G_A(q^2)/g_A$ . Hence

$$\Delta m_\pi^2 = 3ie^2 \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{q^2} F_P(q^2) F_V(q^2) F_A(q^2).$$

We thus recover the same expression for  $\Delta m_\pi^2$  as given in Eq. (4.13) by a completely different route. All that remains is to specify the regularization procedure.

Having obtained expressions for the subdiagrams making up the pion polarization, it becomes a simple matter to identify the underlying physics of the pion mass splitting in more detail. To this end, let us introduce the electromagnetic self-energies  $\Sigma^{T_3}$  for the charged ( $T_3 = \pm 1$ ) and neutral ( $T_3 = 0$ ) pions. This self-energy, which has the dimensions of a (mass)<sup>2</sup>, is obtained from the total pion polarization by including the  $\pi qq$  coupling constant  $ig_{\pi qq}$  at each external pion vertex:

$$\Sigma^{T_3} = (ig_{\pi qq})^2 \Pi_{EM}^{T_3}(0). \quad (4.22)$$

Consequently, a negative pion polarization corresponds to a repulsive self-energy, and *vice versa*. Now this  $\Pi_{EM}^{T_3}(0)$ , and therefore  $\Sigma^{T_3}$ , consists of the sum of *all* the polarization diagrams appearing in Fig. 19 plus Fig. 20. Thus we have reinterpreted this  $\Pi_{EM}^{T_3}(0)$  slightly in order to avoid introducing yet another symbol. Let us write out this sum for the two charged states of the pion separately. In doing so, we notice that the sum of diagrams from Fig. 19, that are all in the nature of self-energy insertions on the quark and antiquark lines,

are common to both charge channels. This is so because the quarks and antiquarks enter symmetrically. This is not true for the diagrams in Fig. 20. Here diagram (a) of this figure represents the interaction via photon exchange of the  $\bar{q}q$  pair in the polarization loop. For the like-flavored quarks making up the  $\pi^0$ , this is an attractive interaction; otherwise it is repulsive. Finally the dumbbell diagrams in Fig. 20(b) only contribute in the charged channel due to the electromagnetic vertices that they contain. We continue to work in the chiral limit. Then the electromagnetic (mass)<sup>2</sup> of the  $\pi^0$  is

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\pi^0}^2 &= (ig_{\pi qq})^2 \left[ \underbrace{\Pi_{EM}^{(a+b)}(0) + \Pi_{EM}^{(c+d)}(0)}_{\text{Fig. 19}} \right] + (ig_{\pi qq})^2 \underbrace{\{\Pi_{EM}^0(0)\}}_{\text{Fig. 20(a)}}_{scatt} \\ &= \Sigma_{self} + \Sigma_{scatt}^0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

Further progress is made by calculating the actual values of all these pion self-energies. This is completed in Appendix A7. The scattering contribution represented by the last term is known from Eq. (A75). It is negative as anticipated (in the Feynman gauge), and *exactly cancels* the quark self-energy contribution given by the sum in the first bracket. One finds by direct calculation the result given in Eq. (A108) that

$$\Sigma_{self} = -\Sigma_{scatt}^0 = ie^2 g_A^{-1} \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} \left\{ 4tr(e_q^2) + \frac{3}{2}(F_V^2(q^2) - 1) \right\} F_P(q^2). \quad (4.24)$$

Thus  $m_{\pi^0}^2 = 0$ : the neutral pion does not acquire any electromagnetic mass at all from its own internal electromagnetic interactions in the chiral limit. The increase in its mass due to the electromagnetically heavier quarks it contains is compensated for exactly by the attractive interaction between these quarks. Notice that this is a gauge invariant statement. While the individual terms appearing in Eq. (4.23), are not all gauge-invariant, their sum is. More formally this result, which is just Dashen's theorem in operation, has to follow, once one realises that the inclusion of the photon gauge field via minimal coupling breaks the  $U(1)_V \times SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2)$  chiral symmetry of the original ENJL Lagrangian in Eq. (2.8) down to  $U_A(1) \times U_V(1)$ . The massless  $\pi^0$  is simply the Goldstone mode realization of this residual symmetry. As we have shown, this result is satisfied in an entirely non-trivial way by the ENJL model. It is also a proof that our set of polarization diagrams to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha N_c)$  is correct and complete.

By contrast, the charged chiral pion picks up a non-zero electromagnetic mass:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\pi^\pm}^2 &= (ig_{\pi qq})^2 \left[ \underbrace{\Pi_{EM}^{(a+b)}(0) + \Pi_{EM}^{(c+d)}(0)}_{\text{Fig. 19}} \right] + (ig_{\pi qq})^2 \underbrace{\{\Pi_{EM}^\pm(0)\}}_{\text{Fig. 20(a)}}_{scatt} \\ &\quad + (ig_{\pi qq})^2 \left[ \underbrace{\Pi_{EM}^{(\pi+a_L)}(0) + \Pi_{EM}^{(a_1)}(0)}_{\text{Fig. 20(b)}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

or

$$m_{\pi^\pm}^2 = \Sigma_{self} + \Sigma_{scatt}^\pm + \Sigma_{dumbbells}^\pm \quad (4.26)$$

using a self-evident notation for the various contributions to the self-energy of the charged pion. In this expression, both the quark self-energy contribution as well as the scattering contribution, are positive, the latter being so because the EM interaction between  $\bar{q}q$  pairs of different flavors ( $\bar{u}d$  or  $\bar{d}u$ ) is repulsive. Thus the last term arising from the sum dumbbell diagrams must be negative, and, as we will see, strongly so, in order to cancel out most of the repulsive self-energy associated with the first two terms. We naturally regain Eq. (4.15) again by forming the difference  $m_{\pi^\pm}^2 - m_{\pi^0}^2$ . As we have seen, only the charged pion contributes to this difference. In Fig. 21, we display the various contributions to the electromagnetic (masses)<sup>2</sup> of the  $\pi^0$  and  $\pi^\pm$ , using the same parameter set as for evaluating Eq. (4.13). In examining this figure, it should again be borne in mind that the individual shifts are gauge-dependent (we have used the Feynman gauge). Only the total electromagnetic (masses)<sup>2</sup>, and therefore their splitting, are gauge-invariant quantities.

These results only hold in the chiral limit of vanishing pion mass. Their extension to the non-chiral case of physical pions requires re-evaluation of the same set of diagrams with the external pion placed on its mass shell at  $k^2 = m_\pi^2$  already in the absence of its own internal electromagnetic field. This is a tedious task, even for the minimal NJL model [15], and no less so in chiral perturbation theory [38]. However, the main conclusions reached by including non-chiral effects [15] carry over without change into the present calculation, and can be restated quite simply. The expression (4.12) accounts for the major part of the electromagnetic mass shift. In addition, the assumption of a finite current quark mass in Eq. (2.8) breaks the chiral symmetry explicitly. This gives the pions of the model a finite mass  $m_\pi^2 \sim \hat{m}$  as per Eq. (2.100). The subleading (in  $m_\pi^2$ ) contribution to the electromagnetic splitting from this source comes from expanding the scattering and dumbbell diagrams in Fig. 20 in terms of  $m_\pi^2$ . This gives rise to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha m_\pi^2)$  correction terms in the neutral channel, but an additional chiral logarithm  $\sim \alpha m_\pi^2 \ln m_\pi^2$  appears in the charged channels. The latter term, which is identical to the correction found in CHPT [38], arises specifically from the pion dumbbell diagram in Fig. 20. It dominates the non-chiral correction. Since the chiral limit of this diagram, as given by Eq. (4.18), is the same for both versions of the NJL model, we can take the precise form of the chiral logarithm correction from the former calculation [15] and write

$$\{\Delta m_\pi^2\}_{non-chiral} = \Delta m_\pi^2 - \frac{3\alpha}{4\pi} \ln(m_\pi^2/m_\sigma^2) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha m_\pi^2) + \dots \quad (4.27)$$



for the ENJL model too. The chiral logarithm correction in this equation coincides exactly with the result obtained in chiral perturbation theory [38] (at scale  $\mu^2 = m_\sigma^2$ ). Numerically, the chiral logarithm and  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha m_\pi^2)$  terms constitute typically 10 % and 1 % of the leading chiral mass splitting term. Unequal current quark masses, or  $\pi^0\eta$  or  $\eta'$  mixing in the  $U_L(3) \times U_R(3)$  flavor extension of the ENJL model (including the 't Hooft term [35] to remove the unwanted  $U_A(1)$  symmetry), are additional sources of chiral symmetry breaking that contribute to  $\Delta m_\pi^2$ . Both effects contribute at the few percent level. One knows this from a direct estimate [15] of the up-down current quark mass difference contribution  $\sim (\hat{m}_u - \hat{m}_d)^2$  to  $\Delta m_\pi^2$ , and from a rather general discussion given in [60] for the mixing effects. Bearing these results in mind, one is led to regard the mass of the charged pion, and especially the  $\pi^\pm - \pi^0$  mass difference, as an essentially electromagnetic phenomenon.

## V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this paper, we have established that the two sum rules of Weinberg for massless QCD, plus the six sum rules introduced by Gasser and Leutwyler in connection with chiral perturbation theory, are all obeyed by spectral densities that are generated by the Nambu-Jona-Lasinio model Lagrangian in its minimal, as well as in its extended form, and which includes vector and axial vector degrees of freedom. The only exceptions to this statement occur for the zero moment sum rules [Eqs. (3.34), (3.53) and (3.54)] that acquire a finite value proportional to the quark condensate density that represents the order parameter of the model. We suggest that this finding might perhaps be an example of a more general feature of any chiral Hamiltonian that energetically favors a chirally broken groundstate with a finite quark condensate.

The NJL model in either form is both non-renormalizable and non-confining. Thus the statements regarding sum rules are subject to stating what sort of regularization procedure has been followed. We show in particular that the sum rules hold for spectral densities computed from polarization amplitudes which have been regulated according to the Pauli-Villars prescription. As might be anticipated, the PV-scheme introduces an unphysical behavior into the spectral densities at high energies, where these densities become negative instead of remaining positive definite. Nevertheless this happens in such a way that the sum rules continue to be saturated. We interpret this rather surprising conclusion to be a consequence of the underlying chiral symmetry properties of the Lagrangian and its faithful representation under the PV-scheme. As a corollary to this statement, we find that the violation, due to PV-regularization, of the positive definite nature of the model densities becomes less and

less important for the sum rules involving higher and higher inverse moments, such as the sum rule determining the pion polarizability, for example.

While the sum rules alluded to above also hold for the spectral densities belonging to the minimal NJL model that does not contain any explicit vector meson modes, this is perhaps less interesting from the point of view of physical applications. The sum rules involve *inter alia* explicit reference to both vector and axial vector densities, and so it is of direct physical interest to consider such degrees of freedom explicitly. With this in mind, we have revisited the problem of incorporating these modes into the NJL model in order to determine the behavior of the associated spectral densities and their masses. The basic effects of these modes are (a) to renormalize the pion decay constant and  $\pi qq$  coupling constant in a complementary fashion such that the Goldberger-Treiman relation is retained, and (b) to concentrate the vector and axial vector strengths of the one-loop spectral densities of the minimal NJL model into two well-defined peaks at low energies that lie just above the  $\bar{q}q$  continuum threshold. This redistribution of strength takes place in such a way, however, that all the sum rules continue to be obeyed. If the positions of these peaks are taken to define the  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  meson masses of the ENJL model, their numerical positions are found to be in qualitative accord with the experimental masses of the physical  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  mesons, suggesting that this identification has physical meaning.

We have combined the sum rules techniques developed in this paper, together with other calculated information to identify ENJL expressions for the empirical coupling constants introduced by Gasser and Leutwyler into chiral perturbation theory, to evaluate the current algebra expression of Das *et al.* for the charged to neutral electromagnetic mass splitting of the pion, and to compute the charged pion's polarizability from Holstein's sum rule. In extracting the coupling constants of chiral perturbation theory, it has been borne in mind that the physically relevant scale-invariant constants,  $\bar{l}_i$ , are not well-defined in the chiral limit because of the chiral logarithms they contain. However, the combination  $\bar{l}_i + \ln(m_\pi^2/\mu^2)$  is well-defined, being proportional to the renormalized  $l_i^r$  of Gasser and Leutwyler, and it is this combination that one can extract from the ENJL model. In fact, it is possible to go further and extract the  $\bar{l}_i$ 's themselves due to the following circumstance. One can show that the leading order non-chiral corrections to the ENJL amplitudes are precisely in the form of chiral logarithms that occur with the correct coefficients to reproduce the combination given above (at the scale of the sigma meson mass of the model). The appearance of the correct chiral logarithm has been demonstrated explicitly for the case of  $\bar{l}_6$ , for example, which must be identified from a calculation of the pion radius. One is thus fully justified in solving for the  $\bar{l}_i$  themselves from the ENJL predictions of the  $l_i^r$ . This we have done and have obtained

reasonable agreement with the empirical values of the  $\bar{l}_i$ 's as set out in Table III.

The sum rule calculation of the pion polarizability  $\alpha_E$  made direct use of the ENJL model generated spectral densities, as well as the ENJL expression for the pion radius. The resulting expression for  $\alpha_E$ , which coincides exactly in form with the CHPT result for this quantity, only depends on the difference  $\bar{l}_6^{ENJL} - \bar{l}_5^{ENJL}$ . This allows common terms in the two ENJL values for the coupling constants to cancel, and leads to an upper limit of  $\alpha/(8\pi^2 m_\pi f_\pi^2) \approx 6 \times 10^{-4} \text{fm}^3$  on  $\alpha_E$  in terms of the physical mass and decay constant of the pion. This is an important result, since it represents a *prediction* of the ENJL model approach that may be compared directly with the chiral perturbation theory prediction ( $\alpha_E^{chpt} = 2.7 \times 10^{-4} \text{fm}^3$ ), as well as the result of Ref. [55] ( $\alpha_E^{QCD} = 5.6 \pm 0.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{fm}^3$ ) that is based on an evaluation of Holstein's sum rule using approximate QCD spectral densities and methods. We also showed that the limiting value of  $\alpha_E$  quoted above is reduced by  $g_A^2$ , the quark axial form factor squared, in the presence of axial vector mesons accompanying the pion. Such meson clouds lead to a less polarizable system: for  $g_A = 0.75$ , one finds  $\alpha_E = 3.4 \times 10^{-4} \text{fm}^3$  that is nicely bracketed by the chiral perturbation theory and QCD sum rule predictions. By contrast, the  $\rho$  mesons do not change the pion polarization at all. Their contributions cancel out completely, in complete agreement with the findings of Holstein [22], who employed delta function spectral densities together with Weinberg's vector meson mass relation and the KSFRF relation.

Finally we must caution that the the limiting value on  $\alpha_E$  quoted above is subject to a multiplicative correction of the form  $[1 + \mathcal{O}(m_\pi^2) + \mathcal{O}(1/N_c)]$  where the additional modifications arise from neglected non-chiral effects of  $\mathcal{O}(m_\pi^2)$  in the sum rule itself, and neglected chiral corrections of  $\mathcal{O}(1/N_c)$  in the evaluation of the spectral densities that enter the sum rule. The calculation of such higher order correction terms within the framework of the ENJL presents an important but formidable challenge, especially since the chiral perturbation theory results for  $\alpha_E$  to two loops, consisting of the calculation and summation of over 100 diagrams(!), are now available [23] for direct comparison.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

One of us (R.H.L.) would like to thank Prof. H.A. Weidenmüller for the hospitality at the Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik. This work has been supported in part by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft DFG under the contract number Hu 233/4-4, and by the German Ministry for Education and Research (BMBF) under contract number 06 HD 742.

## APPENDIX A: REGULARIZATION OF FEYNMAN DIAGRAMS

In this appendix, we discuss the regularization of the various Feynman loop diagrams that have appeared in the main text.

### 1. Gap equation for the light quark masses

The gap equation in the chiral limit  $\hat{m} = 0$  that generates the quark mass self-consistently in both the NJL and ENJL versions of the model Lagrangian in the mean field, or Hartree approximation has been written down in Eq. (2.34), and its extension to include a non-vanishing current quark mass in Eq. (2.89). Either equation contains a single quark loop that diverges quadratically. Regulating this loop according to the Pauli-Villars prescription for the reasons explained in the main text, we get

$$\begin{aligned} m - \hat{m} &= (16G_1N_cm)\left\{\sum_a C_a \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{i}{p^2 - M_a^2}\right\} \\ &= (16G_1N_cm)\left\{\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \sum_a C_a M_a^2 \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2}\right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

provided that

$$\sum_{a=0}^2 C_a = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a M_a^2 = 0, \quad (\text{A2})$$

that may be satisfied by the standard choice [18]

$$C_a = (1, 1, -2) \quad \text{and} \quad M_a^2 = m^2 + \alpha_a \Lambda^2, \quad \alpha_a = (0, 2, 1), \quad (\text{A3})$$

where  $\Lambda$  is the regulating parameter of the PV scheme. We designated the solution of Eq. (A1) in the presence of  $\hat{m}$  as  $m = m^*$  in the main text. One has the useful relation

$$\sum_a C_a M_a^2 \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{G_1 N_c m} (m - \hat{m}) = -\frac{2\pi^2}{N_c} \frac{\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle}{m}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

after using the mean field relation  $m - \hat{m} = -2G_1 \langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$  between  $m$  and the condensate density  $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$  of the quarks.

### 2. The one-loop integral $I(q^2)$

*a. Evaluation*

The integral  $I(q^2)$  given in Eq. (2.33) appears in the pion weak decay constant  $f_p^2 = -4N_c m^2 iI(0)$ , in the pion form factor  $F_P(q^2) = iI(q^2)/iI(0)$ , and thus the pseudoscalar polarization loop as given by Eq. (2.30a). To evaluate it we introduce the standard Feynmann parametrization [18] to find

$$\begin{aligned} I(q^2) &= \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{[(p+q)^2 - m^2][p^2 - m^2]} \\ &= \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} \int_0^\infty d\alpha I_1([m^2 - q^2\alpha(1-\alpha)]), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

where

$$I_1(q^2) = \int_0^\infty \frac{d\rho}{\rho} e^{-i\rho[m^2 - q^2\alpha(1-\alpha)]}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

The last integral is logarithmically divergent. We regulate it using the Pauli-Villars [PV] prescription again. Denote the corresponding PV-regulated quantity with a bar. Then

$$\bar{I}_1(q^2) = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sum_{a=0} C_a \int_\eta^\infty \frac{d\rho}{\rho} e^{-i\rho[M_a^2 - q^2\alpha(1-\alpha)]} = - \sum_{a=0} C_a \ln[M_a^2 - q^2\alpha(1-\alpha)]. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Hence

$$i\bar{I}(s) = i\bar{I}(0) + \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \sum_{a=0} C_a \int_0^1 d\alpha \ln[1 - \frac{s}{M_a^2} \alpha(1-\alpha)], \quad (\text{A8})$$

where

$$i\bar{I}(0) = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \sum_{a=0} C_a \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2}, \quad (\text{A9})$$

after calling  $q^2 = s$ . The remaining integral is elementary. For space-like momentum transfers squared  $-\infty < s < 0$ , it is given by

$$\int_0^1 d\alpha \ln[1 - \frac{s}{m^2} \alpha(1-\alpha)] = 2J(z) - 2, \quad (\text{A10})$$

where

$$J(z) = \sqrt{f} \coth^{-1} \sqrt{f} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{z}} \ln[\sqrt{-z} + \sqrt{1-z}] \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sim \ln \sqrt{-z} (1 - \frac{1}{2z} - \frac{1}{8z^2} + \dots) + \ln 2 - (\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2} \ln 2) \frac{1}{z} \\ &+ (\frac{1}{32} - \frac{1}{8} \ln 2) \frac{1}{z^2} + \dots, \quad |z| \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A12})$$

after setting  $z = s/4m^2$  and

$$f = 1 - \frac{1}{z}. \quad (\text{A13})$$

The PV-regulated version of  $iI(s)$  for space-like  $q^2$  is thus

$$i\bar{I}(s) = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \left[ \sum_{a=0}^2 \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2} + \{(2\sqrt{f} \coth^{-1} \sqrt{f} - 2)\}_{PV} \right], \quad (\text{A14})$$

where the PV-subscript signifies the replacement [18]

$$\{(2\sqrt{f} \coth^{-1} \sqrt{f} - 2)\}_{PV} \rightarrow \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a (2\sqrt{f_a} \coth^{-1} \sqrt{f_a} - 2) \quad (\text{A15})$$

in terms of the variable

$$f_a = 1 - \frac{4M_a^2}{s}. \quad (\text{A16})$$

In accordance with Feynman's causal prescription [18],  $i\bar{I}(s)$  has to be continued to time-like  $q^2 = s > 0$  by passing along the upper lip of the cut starting at the branch point at  $s = 4m^2$  and running to  $\infty$ . This in turn means that the square roots in logarithmic function determining  $J(z)$  have to be chosen such that

$$\sqrt{-z} = |z|^{1/2} e^{i(\phi-\pi)/2}, \quad 0 < \phi < 2\pi \quad (\text{A17})$$

$$\sqrt{1-z} = |1-z|^{1/2} e^{i(\theta-\pi)/2}, \quad 0 < \theta < 2\pi \quad (\text{A18})$$

on the “first”, or physical sheet of  $J(z)$ , in terms of the complex variables  $z = |z| \exp i\phi$  and  $z-1 = |z-1| \exp i\theta$ . The further branch points at  $z = s/4M_a^2$ ,  $a = 1, 2$ , that are introduced into  $J(s/4m^2)_{PV}$  and thus  $i\bar{I}(s)$  by the regulating masses of the Pauli-Villars scheme are handled in the same way. The schedule of forms for the multivalued complex function  $J(z)$  can now be written down from

$$J(z) = \left| \frac{z-1}{z} \right|^{1/2} e^{i(\theta-\phi)/2} \ln [|z|^{1/2} e^{i(\phi-\pi)/2} + |1-z|^{1/2} e^{i(\theta-\pi)/2}]. \quad (\text{A19})$$

Along the real axis  $z = x$  of the first sheet  $J(x)$  thus behaves like

$$J(x) = \begin{cases} (1 - \frac{1}{x})^{1/2} \ln(\sqrt{-x} + \sqrt{1-x}) = \sqrt{f} \coth^{-1} \sqrt{f}, & -\infty < x < 0 \\ (\frac{1}{x} - 1)^{1/2} \sin^{-1} \sqrt{x} = \sqrt{-f} \cot^{-1} \sqrt{-f}, & 0 < x < 1 \\ (1 - \frac{1}{x})^{1/2} (\ln[\sqrt{x} + \sqrt{x-1}] - i\frac{\pi}{2}) = \sqrt{f} (\tanh^{-1} \sqrt{f} - i\frac{\pi}{2}), & 1 < x < \infty, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A20})$$

where  $f = 1 - 1/x$ . The appearance of an imaginary part for  $x > 1$  is associated with the (unphysical)  $\bar{q}q$  decay threshold that is one of the drawbacks of the NJL model.

In order to discuss the possible poles of the vector and axial mode propagators in ENJL, we also require the analytic continuation,  $\tilde{J}(z)$  of  $J(z)$  through the cut onto the second sheet. This sheet is defined by letting the angles  $\phi$  and  $\theta$  assume values in the angular interval  $-2\pi < \theta, \phi < 0$ . Except for the sector  $1 < x < \infty$  along the real axis of the second sheet where the two functions coincide by construction, the analytic continuation  $\tilde{J}(x)$  is a different function on the second sheet. In particular, its behavior along the real axis of that sheet is as follows:

$$\tilde{J}(x) = \begin{cases} J(x) - i\pi\sqrt{f}, & -\infty < x < 0 \\ J(x) - \pi\sqrt{-f}, & 0 < x < 1 \\ J(x), & 1 < x < \infty. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A21})$$

We note in particular that  $\tilde{J}(x)$  like  $J(x)$ , is also real for  $0 < x < 1$  but picks up an imaginary part in the sector  $-\infty < x < 0$ . Their behavior at the origin as  $x \rightarrow 0^+$  is also different:  $J(x) \rightarrow x^{-1/2} \sin x^{1/2} \rightarrow 1$ , but  $\tilde{J}(x) \rightarrow -\pi x^{-1/2} \rightarrow -\infty$ . Thus  $ReJ(x)$  and  $Re\tilde{J}(x)$  coincide for  $-\infty < x < 0$  and  $1 > x > \infty$ , but differ for  $0 < x < 1$ , while  $ImJ(x)$  and  $Im\tilde{J}(x)$  differ in the first interval but coincide in the latter two. All of these properties are essential for appreciating the analytic structure of the various polarization functions to follow. The real parts of  $J(x)$  and  $\tilde{J}(x)$  are plotted for real arguments in Fig. 7.

Returning to the problem at hand, we can now write down a general form for the PV-regulated version of  $iI(q^2)$  for all  $q^2 = s$  as

$$i\bar{I}(s) = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \left[ \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2} + \{(2J(s/4m^2) - 2)\}_{PV} \right], \quad (\text{A22})$$

where

$$\{(2J(s/4m^2) - 2)\}_{PV} \rightarrow \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a \{2J(s/4M_a^2) - 2\}, \quad (\text{A23})$$

as before. The form of  $J$  appropriate to the sheet, and interval that its argument falls in on that sheet, has to be selected from Eqs. (A20) or (A21). In particular, for time-like  $q^2 = s \geq 4m^2$ , the explicit form of  $Im[i\bar{I}(s + i\epsilon)]$  along the upper lip of the cut plane is

$$\begin{aligned}
Im[i\bar{I}(s)] &= -\frac{1}{16\pi} \left\{ \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m^2}{s}} \theta(s - 4m^2) \right\}_{PV} \\
&= -\frac{1}{16\pi} \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a \sqrt{1 - \frac{4M_a^2}{s}} \theta(s - 4M_a^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{A24}$$

Thus, apart from the contribution starting at  $s = 4m^2$ , the imaginary part of  $i\bar{I}(s)$  also contains additional contributions of different weights coming from the artificial thresholds that are introduced by the regulating masses of the Pauli-Villars scheme at  $s = 4m^2(1 + \Lambda^2/m^2)$  and  $s = 4m^2(1 + 2\Lambda^2/m^2)$ . This in turn means that  $Im[i\bar{I}(s)]$  need not remain negative definite for  $s$  large enough, as could perhaps have been anticipated from the introduction of indefinite metric sectors of Hilbert space by the PV-regulation procedure [18].

### *b. Asymptotic behavior and dispersion relations*

The asymptotic behavior of the function  $J(z)$  is given in Eq. (A12) which shows that it diverges logarithmically. Thus if the PV instruction were removed from the second factor in Eq. (A22), then the resulting expression for  $iI(s)$  would also diverge logarithmically,  $iI(s) \sim \log(-s)$ , with  $s \rightarrow \infty$  in the complex plane. The PV regularization instruction alters this behavior drastically to a  $1/s$  convergent one as we show below. The change-over is, not surprisingly, related to keeping the imaginary part PV regulated as in Eq. (A24) (which is finite and does not need regularization anyway), which then determines what sort of dispersion relation the expression for  $iI(s)$  can satisfy in a consistent fashion. The change in asymptotic behavior in the present case comes about because upon PV regulating  $J(s/4m^2)$ , the conditions that  $\sum_a C_a$  and  $\sum_a C_a M_a^2$  must vanish, suppress both the  $\ln(-s)$  and the  $(1/s) \ln(-s)$  terms in Eq. (A12), leaving only a  $1/s$  and the sub-leading logarithm  $(1/s^2) \ln(-s)$  to survive:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{J}(s/4m^2) &= \sum_a C_a J(s/4M_a^2) \sim -\frac{1}{2} \sum_a C_a \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2} + \frac{1}{s} \left( \sum_a C_a M_a^2 \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2} \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{s^2} \ln(-s/4m^2) \left( \sum_a C_a M_a^4 \right) + O(1/s^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{A25}$$

Inserting this form of  $\bar{J}$  into Eq. (A22) and using the result that  $\sum_a C_a M_a^4 = 2\Lambda^4$  to simplify the coefficient of the  $(1/s^2) \ln(-s)$  term, one obtains the behavior of  $i\bar{I}(s)$  at large  $s$  as

$$i\bar{I}(s) = \frac{1}{8\pi^2 s} \sum_a C_a M_a^2 \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2} - \frac{\Lambda^4}{4\pi^2} \frac{1}{s^2} \ln(-s) + O(1/s^2), \tag{A26}$$

instead of  $\sim \ln(-s)$ . Thus the function  $i\bar{I}(s)$  is rendered sufficiently convergent to satisfy an unsubtracted dispersion relation of the form



$$i\bar{I}(s) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{4m^2}^{\infty} dt \frac{\text{Im}[i\bar{I}(t)]}{t-s}. \quad (\text{A27})$$

It is instructive to verify this result explicitly, for the calculation shows how the PV-regularization of the imaginary part conspires to allow the dispersion relation to hold. One finds, using Eq.(A24), that

$$i\bar{I}(s) = -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \lim_{\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a \int_{4M_a^2}^{\mu^2} \frac{dt}{t-s} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4M_a^2}{t}} \theta(t - 4M_a^2). \quad (\text{A28})$$

The auxillary cutoff  $\mu^2$  has been introduced as a calculational device since the individual integrals diverge before carrying out the PV summation. These can be evaluated explicitly using the change of variable  $t = 4M_a^2 \cosh^2 \phi$ . Assuming  $s < 0$  for definiteness, one obtains

$$i\bar{I}(s) = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \lim_{\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a \left[ 2\sqrt{f_a} \coth^{-1} \sqrt{f_a(1 - \frac{4M_a^2}{\mu^2})^{-1}} - 2 \cosh^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{\mu^2}{4M_a^2}} \right]. \quad (\text{A29})$$

Taking the limit  $\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty$  is harmless in the argument of the inverse hyperbolic cotangent function, but the second term diverges logarithmically. The PV-instruction removes this divergence and replaces it by a finite constant in the standard way as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \lim_{\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a \cosh^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{\mu^2}{4M_a^2}} &\rightarrow - \lim_{\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a \ln \frac{\mu^2}{M_a^2} \\ &= - \lim_{\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a \ln \frac{\mu^2}{m^2} + \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A30})$$

since, according to the PV regulation rules, the instructions of Eqs. (A2) take precedence over taking the limit  $\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty$ . Inserting this result back into Eq. (A29) and reinstating an irrelevant  $-2$  under the PV-regulation bracket, we regain Eq. (A14).

On the other hand, if the PV instruction on the imaginary part given by Eq. (A24) is *dropped*, then  $iI(s)$  diverges logarithmically as we have seen. Then, not  $iI(s)$ , but only  $iI(s)/s$ , is sufficiently convergent to give no contribution upon integration around a closed contour  $C_\infty$  at infinity in the complex  $s$  plane. Hence the dispersion relation for *this* representation of  $iI(s)$  requires *one* subtraction,

$$iI(s) = iI(0) + \frac{s}{\pi} \int_{4m^2}^{\infty} dt \frac{\text{Im}[iI(t)]}{t(t-s)} \quad (\text{A31})$$

where only the (formally) infinite constant  $iI(0)$  now requires regularization. This “dispersive” type of regularization prescription was followed in Ref. [13] for example, in conjunction with a proper time cutoff. If we opt for PV-regulating  $iI(0)$ , then Eq. (A31) leads back to

Eq (A8), or equivalently to Eq. (A14) again, but with the PV-instruction on the second term in either of these equations removed, if the unregulated imaginary part of  $iI(s)$  as given by Eq. (A24) is used. One then has

$$\frac{s}{\pi} \int_{4m^2}^{\infty} dt \frac{Im[iI(t)]}{t(t-s)} = -\frac{s}{(4\pi)^2} \int_{4m^2}^{\infty} \frac{dt}{t} \frac{\sqrt{1 - \frac{4m^2}{t}}}{(t-s)} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \int_0^1 d\alpha \ln \left[ 1 - \frac{s}{m^2} \alpha(1-\alpha) \right] \quad (\text{A32})$$

under the successive transformation of variables  $u = (1 - 4m^2/t)^{1/2}$ , followed by  $\alpha = (1-u)/2$  after an integration by parts. Hence

$$iI(s) = i\bar{I}(0) + \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \int_0^1 d\alpha \ln \left[ 1 - \frac{s}{m^2} \alpha(1-\alpha) \right] \quad (\text{A33})$$

that reproduces Eq. (A8).

The origin of the difference between Eq. (A8) and the above expression for  $iI(s)$  thus lies entirely in the way the imaginary part is treated. This in turn means that either an unsubtracted, or a once-subtracted dispersion relation is satisfied by the regulated function. Not surprisingly, these two cases can lead to regulated functions that behave very differently at large momentum transfers. A summary of the asymptotic behavior of functions that involve amplitudes regulated via these two methods is given in Table VI.

### 3. Pion weak decay constant, form factor and pseudoscalar polarization loop in the NJL model

It is now a simple matter to write down expressions for the regulated pion weak decay constant, the form factor, and thus the one-loop pseudoscalar polarization function  $\Pi^{PP}(q^2)$  in terms of  $i\bar{I}(q^2)$ . One has

$$f_p^2 = -4N_c m^2 i\bar{I}(0) = -\frac{N_c m^2}{4\pi^2} \sum_a C_a \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2} \quad (\text{A34})$$

and

$$\bar{F}_P(s) = \frac{i\bar{I}(s)}{i\bar{I}(0)} = \left[ 1 - \frac{N_c m^2}{4\pi^2 f_p^2} \{ (2J(s/4m^2) - 2) \}_{PV} \right] \quad (\text{A35a})$$

$$\sim -\frac{N_c m^2}{2\pi^2 f_p^2} \left( \sum_a C_a M_a^2 \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2} \right) \frac{1}{s} + \frac{N_c m^2}{\pi^2 f_p^2} \frac{\Lambda^4}{s^2} \ln(-s), \quad |s| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{A35b})$$

With the aid of the relation (A4) between the quark mass and the condensate density that follows from the PV-regulated version of the gap equation, the asymptotic behavior of  $\bar{F}_P(s)$  can be recast in the transparent form

$$f_p^2 \bar{F}_P(s) \sim \frac{m \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle}{s} + \frac{N_c m^2 \Lambda^4}{\pi^2 s^2} \ln(-s), \quad |s| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{A36})$$

For time-like  $s \geq 4m^2$ , the imaginary part of  $\bar{F}_P(s)$  is obtained from Eq. (A24):

$$\text{Im } \bar{F}_P(s) = \frac{m^2 N_c}{4\pi f_p^2} \left\{ \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m^2}{s}} \theta(s - 4m^2) \right\}_{PV}. \quad (\text{A37})$$

The dispersion relation Eq. (A27) for  $i\bar{I}(s)$  immediately translates into a dispersion relation for the form factor:

$$\bar{F}_P(s) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{4m^2}^{\infty} dt \frac{\text{Im}[\bar{F}_P(t)]}{t - s}. \quad (\text{A38})$$

Note that using the PV-regulated form  $\text{Im}\bar{F}_P(t)$  automatically guarantees the condition  $\bar{F}_P(0) = 1$ , since we have explicitly demonstrated that the dispersion relation satisfied by  $i\bar{I}(s)$  correctly reproduces  $i\bar{I}(0)$  according to Eq (A29).

The pion electromagnetic radius is determined by the derivative  $\bar{F}'_P(s)$  at  $s = 0$ . This derivative is most simply obtained by evaluating

$$\bar{F}'_P(0) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{4m^2}^{\infty} \frac{dt}{t^2} \text{Im}[\bar{F}_P(t)] = \frac{1}{6} \frac{N_c}{4\pi^2 f_p^2} \sum_a C_a \frac{m^2}{M_a^2} = \frac{1}{6} \langle r_p^2 \rangle_{PV}, \quad (\text{A39})$$

using the same change of variable  $t = 4M_a^2 \cosh^2 \phi$  as before. No auxillary cutoff is necessary in this case since each integral converges separately due to the extra  $t$  in the denominator of the integrand. For  $N_c = 3$ , the mean field approximation to the pion radius is thus found to be given by

$$\langle r_p^2 \rangle_{PV} = \frac{3}{4\pi^2 f_p^2} \sum_a C_a \frac{m^2}{M_a^2} \approx \frac{3}{4\pi^2 f_p^2}, \quad (\text{A40})$$

that essentially coincides with the result of Tarrach [48] given on the right of this equation.

Finally we can write down the explicit form of the pseudoscalar polarization and its asymptotic behavior using Eq. (A35b). We take the non-chiral case given in Eq. (2.90):

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Pi}_{nc}^{PP}(s) &= \frac{(m - \hat{m})}{2G_1 m} + \frac{f_\pi^2(s)}{m^2} s \\ &\sim \frac{N_c \Lambda^4}{\pi^2} \frac{1}{s} \ln(-s), \quad |s| \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A41})$$

Notice that the constant term of the combination  $(sf_\pi^2(s)/m^2) \rightarrow sf_p^2 \bar{F}_P(s) \rightarrow \langle \psi \psi \rangle / m = -(m - \hat{m})/2G_1 m$  just cancels the constant term in  $\Pi^{PP}$  to leading order according to Eq. (A36), so that one has to include the next (logarithmic) order in  $\bar{F}_P(s)$  as determined by Eq. (A26) to obtain the stated result. The asymptotic behavior of the regulated pseudoscalar polarizations in the chiral limit for either the NJL model [Eq. (2.30a)] or the ENJL model [Eq (2.48)] are also given by Eq. (A41).

#### 4. Evaluation and properties of the vector and axial vector polarization loops

##### a. The vector polarization $\Pi_T^{VV}(q^2)$

We set  $\mu = \nu$  in Eq. (2.28b) and then contract on  $\mu$  in order to exploit the fact that the vector polarization is expected to be purely transverse. Then

$$g^{\mu\nu}\Pi_{\mu\nu;ab}^{VV} = 3\Pi_T^{VV}\delta_{ab} = 2iN_c\delta_{ab}\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\text{tr}[\gamma^\mu S(p+q)\gamma_\mu S(p)], \quad (\text{A42})$$

after doing the color and flavor traces. Using the fact that

$$\text{tr}[\gamma^\mu(\not{p} + \not{q} + m)\gamma_\mu(\not{p} + m)] = 16m^2 - 8p \cdot (p + q), \quad (\text{A43})$$

one has

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2) &= \frac{16}{3}iN_c\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{2m^2 - p \cdot (p + q)}{[(p + q^2 - m^2)[p^2 - m^2]} \\ &= -16q^2\frac{N_c}{(4\pi)^2}\int_0^1 d\alpha\alpha(1-\alpha)\int_0^\infty\frac{d\rho}{\rho}e^{-i\rho[m^2 - q^2\alpha(1-\alpha)]} \\ &\quad - \frac{32i}{3}\frac{N_c}{(4\pi)^2}\int_0^1 d\alpha\int_0^\infty d\rho\frac{d}{d\rho}\frac{e^{-i\rho[m^2 - q^2\alpha(1-\alpha)]}}{\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A44})$$

The  $\rho$  integrals diverge like  $\ln \rho$  and  $1/\rho$  respectively at the origin. Under PV-regularization, the first integral is just  $\bar{I}_1(q^2)$  as given by Eq. (A7), while the second integral makes no contribution at all since

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a \int_\eta^\infty d\rho \frac{d}{d\rho} \frac{e^{-i\rho[M_a^2 - q^2\alpha(1-\alpha)]}}{\rho} = -\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a \left[ \frac{1}{\eta} - i[M_a^2 - q^2\alpha(1-\alpha)] \right] \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A45})$$

Thus, with  $s = q^2$  again,

$$\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s) = -16s\frac{N_c}{(4\pi^2)}\int_0^1 d\alpha\alpha(1-\alpha)\bar{I}_1(s) \quad (\text{A46a})$$

$$= \frac{N_c s}{6\pi^2} \left[ \sum_a C_a \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2} + \left\{ \frac{1}{3} + (3-f)(\sqrt{f} \coth^{-1} \sqrt{f} - 1) \right\}_{PV} \right] \quad (\text{A46b})$$

$$= \frac{N_c s}{6\pi^2} \sum_a C_a \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2} = -\frac{2}{3} \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} s, \quad s \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{A46c})$$

$$\sim -\frac{1}{s} \ln(-s), \quad |s| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{A46d})$$

with the indicated limiting behavior near the origin and on a great circle in the complex plane. Eq. (A34) has been used to re-introduce the mean field pion decay constant. In obtaining Eq. (A46b), we have used the intermediate result that

$$\int_0^1 d\alpha \alpha(1-\alpha) \ln[1 - \frac{s}{m^2} \alpha(1-\alpha)] = \frac{1}{6} [\frac{1}{3} + (3-f)(\sqrt{f} \coth^{-1} \sqrt{f} - 1)] \quad (\text{A47})$$

for space-like  $s$ , but which may immediately be extended to cover all  $s$ , real or complex, using the definition of the function  $J(z)$  in Eq. (A11).

Thus like  $i\bar{I}(s)$ , only the PV-regulated vector polarization is sufficiently convergent on the great circle to satisfy an unsubtracted dispersion relation,

$$\frac{1}{4} \bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{4m^2}^{\infty} dt \frac{\text{Im}[\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(t)]}{t-s} = - \int_{4m^2}^{\infty} dt \frac{\rho_1^{(0)V}(t)}{t-s} \quad (\text{A48})$$

where

$$\rho_1^{(0)V}(s) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \text{Im}[\bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s)] \quad (\text{A49})$$

is the vector spectral density function. Its explicit form is found with the help of Eq. (A20) to be

$$\rho_1^{(0)V}(s) = \frac{N_c s}{24\pi^2} \left\{ \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m^2}{s}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{4m^2}{s}\right) \theta(s - 4m^2) \right\}_{PV}. \quad (\text{A50})$$

Again we comment that this expression is no longer positive definite for all  $s$  for the same reason as before, due to the PV-instruction. One has a linearly divergent behavior  $\rho_1^V(s) \sim s$  as  $s$  increases if the PV-instruction is removed. If it is kept, however, a short calculation shows that

$$\rho_1^{(0)V}(s) \sim -\frac{N_c}{2\pi^2} \frac{\Lambda^4}{s}, \quad s \rightarrow \infty, \quad (\text{A51})$$

which is convergent at the expense of becoming negative at large  $s$ . However, such a behavior seems unavoidable if at the same time one wants the vector polarization as given by the NJL model to obey an unsubtracted dispersion relation. Indeed, if the PV-instruction is removed in Eq. (A46b) (and therefore also in Eq. (A50), rendering  $\rho_1^{(0)V}(s)$  positive definite) then  $\Pi_T^{VV}(s)$  diverges like  $s \ln(-s)$ , so that two subtractions are required in the dispersion relation for this  $\Pi_T^{VV}(s)$  (or equivalently, a once-subtracted one for the combination  $\Pi_T^{VV}(s)/s$  - see, for example, Ref. [13]),

$$\Pi_T^{VV}(s) = s \Pi_T^{(0)V}(0) + \frac{s^2}{\pi} \int_{4m^2}^{\infty} dt \frac{\text{Im}[\Pi_T^{VV}(t)]}{t^2(t-s)}, \quad (\text{A52})$$

where the prime denotes the value of the derivative at the origin. As with the case of  $i\bar{I}(s)$  and  $iI(s)$ , one can again demonstrate explicitly by direct integration using either the PV-regulated, or the unregulated  $\rho_1^{(0)V}(s)$ , that the dispersion relations (A48) or (A52) lead back to the expression for  $\Pi_T^{VV}(s)$  in Eq. (A46b) with the PV-instruction either present or absent on the second factor.

*b. The longitudinal and transverse axial vector polarization  $\Pi_L^{AA}(q^2)$  and  $\Pi_T^{AA}(q^2)$*

We proved in Eq. (2.47) that the longitudinal axial vector polarization must vanish when all interactions are considered. At one-loop level, however, it does not vanish and is given by Eq. (2.37), i.e.

$$\bar{\Pi}_L^{AA}(q^2) = 4f_p^2 \bar{F}_P(q^2) \quad (\text{A53})$$

after regularization, where  $\bar{F}_P$  is taken from Eq. (A35b) and  $f_p^2$  from Eq. (A34). We use Eq. (2.37) to determine the regulated transverse axial polarization as

$$\bar{\Pi}_T^{AA}(s) = \bar{\Pi}_T^{VV}(s) + 4f_p^2 \bar{F}_P(s) \quad (\text{A54a})$$

$$= 4f_p^2, \quad s \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{A54b})$$

$$\sim -\frac{1}{s} \ln(-s), \quad s \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{A54c})$$

Again  $\Pi_T^{AA}(s)$  will satisfy an unsubtracted dispersion relation like Eq. (A48) containing the axial vector spectral density that is related to  $\rho_1^{(0)V}(s)$ . This can be seen by taking the imaginary part of Eq. (A54a) and using Eq. (A37):

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1^{(0)V}(s) - \rho_1^{(0)A}(s) &= \frac{f_p^2}{\pi} \text{Im}[\bar{F}_P(s)] = \frac{N_c m^2}{4\pi^2} \left\{ \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m^2}{s}} \theta(s - 4m^2) \right\}_{PV} \\ &\sim -\frac{N_c m^2}{\pi^2} \frac{\Lambda^4}{s^2}, \quad s \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A55})$$

Hence the density difference that enters into the two Weinberg sum rules converges like  $1/s^2$ , i.e. faster than either density separately and renders both sum rules convergent for the PV-regulated spectral densities. By contrast, with the PV instruction removed,  $\rho_1^{(0)V}(s) - \rho_1^{(0)A}(s) \sim N_c m^2/(4\pi^2)$  asymptotically, and neither sum rule would converge. The regulated axial density itself is given by

$$\rho_1^{(0)A}(s) = \frac{N_c s}{24\pi^2} \sum_{a=0}^2 C_a \left\{ \sqrt{1 - \frac{4M_a^2}{s}} \left( \left(1 - \frac{4M_a^2}{s}\right) + \frac{6}{s} (M_a^2 - m^2) \right) \theta(s - 4M_a^2) \right\}. \quad (\text{A56})$$

The first Weinberg sum rule is explicitly satisfied by the spectral densities of the minimum NJL model. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} (\rho_1^{(0)V}(s) - \rho_1^{(0)A}(s)) &= \frac{f_p^2}{\pi} \int_{4m^2}^\infty \frac{dt}{t} \text{Im}[\bar{F}_P(t)] \\ &= f_p^2 \bar{F}_P(0) = f_p^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A57})$$

after using the dispersion relation, Eq. (A38), at  $s = 0$  to deduce the value of the integral. To check the second sum rule we require

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\infty ds (\rho_1^{(0)V}(s) - \rho_1^{(0)A}(s)) &= \frac{m^2 N_c}{4\pi^2} \lim_{\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty} \sum_a C_a \int_{4M_a^2}^{4\mu^2} ds \sqrt{1 - \frac{4M_a^2}{s}} \theta(s - 4M_a^2) \\
&= \frac{m^2 N_c}{\pi^2} \lim_{\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty} \sum_a C_a [\mu^2 (1 - \frac{M_a^2}{\mu^2})^{\frac{1}{2}} - M_a^2 \cosh^{-1}(\frac{\mu^2}{M_a^2})^{\frac{1}{2}}] \\
&= \frac{m^2 N_c}{2\pi^2} \sum_a C_a M_a^2 \ln \frac{M_a^2}{m^2}, \quad \mu^2 \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned} \tag{A58}$$

or

$$\int_0^\infty ds (\rho_1^{(0)V}(s) - \rho_1^{(0)A}(s)) = -m \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle, \tag{A59}$$

where the last step follows from Eq. (A4).

## 5. Electromagnetic form factor of the pion in the ENJL model

In the absence of vector and axial vector meson fields, the electromagnetic form factor of the pion is given by the  $F_P(q^2)$  of Eq. (2.32c) to  $\mathcal{O}(N_c)$  in the mean field approximation. In the presence of the vector fields, this is no longer the case, since the axial form factor  $G_A(0) = g_A < 1$  differs from unity. This renormalizes the  $\pi qq$  coupling constant,  $g_p \rightarrow g_{\pi qq} = g_p / \sqrt{g_A}$ , that in turn renormalizes the pion charge so that  $F_P(0) \neq 1$ . However, as we now show, a compensatory renormalization of the pion field also occurs due to the pseudovector coupling and pseudoscalar-pseudovector interference terms introduced by the axial vector meson field that restores the total charge of the pion to its physical value. The inclusion of the vector meson fields does not alter this conclusion since  $F_V(0) = 1$ .

The set of diagrams that determines the charged pion's electromagnetic form factor in the ENJL model is obtained by coupling the photon to both the quark and antiquark lines making up the  $\gamma\pi\pi$  triangle diagram. Since the electromagnetic current is renormalized as per Eq. (4.1), the photon vertex contains a contribution from the  $\rho^0$  exchange diagram too. The resulting  $\gamma\pi\pi$  vertex thus has two contributions as depicted in Fig. 16. We work in the chiral limit of zero pion mass. Then the contribution from the first diagram of Fig. 16 to  $\pi qq$  vertex can be written as a four vector of the form

$$\frac{1}{i} \Gamma_\mu^{(em)}(k', k) = (ig_{\pi qq})^2 \lambda_\pi(0) \frac{1}{i} V_\mu^{(em)}(k', k). \tag{A60}$$

Adding in the second diagram replaces  $\Gamma_\mu^{(em)}(k', k)$  by

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_\mu^{(em)}(k', k) &\rightarrow \Gamma_\mu^{(em)}(k', k) - \Pi_{\mu\rho}^{VV}(q^2) D^{VV;\rho\sigma}(q^2) \Gamma_\sigma^{(em)}(k', k) \\
&= [L_{\mu\nu} + F_V(q^2) T_{\mu\nu}] \Gamma^{(em);\nu}(k', k) \\
&= F_V(q^2) \Gamma_\mu^{(em)}(k', k).
\end{aligned} \tag{A61}$$

The last expression is only valid for on-shell pions. The electromagnetic form factor  $F_\pi(q^2)$  of the pion can then be identified from

$$e_\pi F_\pi(q^2)(k+k')_\mu = \Gamma_\mu^{(em)}(k', k) F_V(q^2) \quad (\text{A62})$$

We thus only need to evaluate the contribution from the first diagram. Its spinor structure can be read off from Eq. (2.67) as  $P^a \cos \theta \pm i(\hat{k} \cdot A^a) \sin \theta$  for outgoing (incoming) pions of isospin  $a$  using the abbreviations  $P^a = i\gamma_5 \tau^a$  and  $A_\mu^a = \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \tau^a$ . We first construct the fully off-shell version of  $-iV_\mu^{(em)}(k', k)$  and then specialize to on-shell chiral pions to obtain the charge form factor. One finds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{i} V_\mu^{(em)}(k', k) &= \cos \theta' \cos \theta \frac{1}{i} V_\mu^{PP}(k', k) + \cos \theta \sin \theta' V_\mu^{A_\nu P}(k', k) \hat{k}'^\nu \\ &\quad - \cos \theta' \sin \theta V_\mu^{PA_\nu}(k', k) \hat{k}^\nu + \sin \theta' \sin \theta \hat{k}'^\nu \frac{1}{i} V_\mu^{A_\nu A_\rho}(\hat{k}', k) k^\rho \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A63})$$

for absorbing a photon of four momentum  $q = k' - k$ . The individual amplitudes in this expression arise from the various combinations of pseudoscalar and axial vector vertices that are introduced through the revised  $\pi qq$  interaction. They are given by

$$V_\mu^{PP}(k', k) = (-2ie_\pi N_c) \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \text{tr}[\gamma_5 S(p+k') \gamma_\mu S(p+k) \gamma_5 S(p)] \quad (\text{A64a})$$

$$V_\mu^{PA_\nu}(k', k) = (-2e_\pi N_c) \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \text{tr}[\gamma_5 S(p+k') \gamma_\mu S(p+k) \gamma_\nu \gamma_5 S(p)] \quad (\text{A64b})$$

$$V_\mu^{A_\nu A_\rho}(k', k) = (2ie_\pi N_c) \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \text{tr}[\gamma_\nu \gamma_5 S(p+k') \gamma_\mu S(p+k) \gamma_\rho \gamma_5 S(p)]. \quad (\text{A64c})$$

The symbol  $e_\pi = eT_3$  is the charge carried by the pion.

A direct calculation gives [15]

$$V_\mu^{PP}(k', k) = -e_\pi \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} F_P(q^2) (k+k')_\mu, \text{ onshell}, \quad (\text{A65})$$

for the first amplitude, a result that also extends to the 1/2 off-shell amplitude in the chiral limit. On the other hand, repeated use of the Ward identity

$$\not{k} \gamma_5 = 2m \gamma_5 + S^{-1}(p+k) \gamma_5 + \gamma_5 S^{-1}(p) = -[2m \gamma_5 + \gamma_5 S^{-1}(p+k) + S^{-1}(p) \gamma_5] \quad (\text{A66})$$

leads to the results

$$\begin{aligned} V_\mu^{PA_\nu}(k', k) k^\nu &= -2im V_\mu^{PP}(k', k) + e_\pi \Pi_\mu^{PA}(k'^2) \\ &= -2im V_\mu^{PP}(k', k) - 2i \frac{e_\pi}{m} f_p^2(k') k'_\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A67})$$



using Eq. (2.30b) for  $\Pi_\mu^{PA}$ , and

$$k'^\nu V_\mu^{A\nu A\rho}(k', k) = 2imV_\mu^{PA\rho}(k', k) + e_\pi[\Pi_{\mu\rho}^{AA}(k^2) - \Pi_{\mu\rho}^{VV}(q^2)]. \quad (\text{A68})$$

It follows that

$$k'^\nu V_\mu^{A\nu A\rho}(k', k)k^\rho = 2imV_\mu^{PA\nu}(k', k)k^\nu + e_\pi[\Pi_{\mu\nu}^{AA}(k^2) - \Pi_{\mu\nu}^{VV}(q^2)]k^\nu. \quad (\text{A69})$$

Only the longitudinal part of the axial polarization contributes to this expression, since  $\Pi_{\mu\nu}^{AA}(k^2)k^\nu = \Pi_L^{AA}(k^2)k_\mu = 4f_p^2(k^2)k_\mu$ . However, there is also a contribution from the (purely transverse) vector polarization, since its argument involves the momentum transfer  $q_\mu = (k' - k)_\mu$  that is different from  $k_\mu$ . Then  $T_{\mu\nu}(q^2)k^\nu = T_{\mu\nu}(q^2)k'^\nu$ , since  $T_{\mu\nu}(q^2) = g_{\mu\nu} - q_\mu q_\nu / q^2$ , and

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu}^{VV}(q^2)k^\nu = \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2)T_{\mu\nu}(q^2)k^\nu = \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2)(q^2)k'^\nu = \frac{1}{2}\Pi_T^{VV}(q^2)T_{\mu\nu}(q^2)(k + k')^\nu. \quad (\text{A70})$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} k'^\nu V_\mu^{A\nu A\rho}(k', k)k^\rho &= 4m^2 V_\mu^{PP}(k', k) + 4e_\pi[f_p^2(k'^2)k'_\mu + f_p^2(k^2)k_\mu] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}e_\pi \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2)T_{\mu\nu}(q^2)(k + k')^\nu. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A71})$$

Collecting terms, one finds that the final form of the off-shell electromagnetic vertex is

$$\begin{aligned} V_\mu^{(em)}(k', k) &= (\cos \theta' - \frac{2m}{\sqrt{k'^2}} \sin \theta') V_\mu^{PP}(k', k) (\cos \theta - \frac{2m}{\sqrt{k^2}} \sin \theta) \\ &\quad - 2\frac{e_\pi}{m} f_p^2(k'^2) k'_\mu (\cos \theta' - \frac{2m}{\sqrt{k'^2}} \sin \theta') \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{k^2}} \\ &\quad - 2\frac{e_\pi}{m} f_p^2(k^2) k_\mu (\cos \theta - \frac{2m}{\sqrt{k^2}} \sin \theta) \frac{\sin \theta'}{\sqrt{k'^2}} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} e_\pi \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2) T_{\mu\nu}(q^2) (k + k')^\nu \frac{\sin \theta'}{\sqrt{k'^2}} \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{k^2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A72})$$

after using the symmetry property  $V_\mu^{A\nu P}(k', k) = -V_\mu^{PA\nu}(k, k')$ . The on-shell value for chiral pions,  $k'^2 = k^2 = m_\pi^2 = 0$ , is obtained by inserting the limiting values  $\cos \theta \rightarrow 1$  and  $(2m/\sqrt{k^2}) \sin \theta \rightarrow 8G_2 f_\pi^2 = (1 - g_A)$  which come from Eqs. (2.71) and hold for both the primed and unprimed quantities. Then

$$V_\mu^{(em)}(k', k) = -e_\pi \frac{f_\pi^2}{m^2} \left\{ g_A F_P(q^2) + (1 - g_A) + \frac{(1 - g_A)^2}{8f_\pi^2} \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2) \right\} (k + k')_\mu \quad (\text{A73})$$

is manifestly gauge invariant. In conjunction with Eqs. (A60) and (A62), it leads to the identification

$$F_\pi(q^2) = \left\{ g_A F_P(q^2) + (1 - g_A) + (1 - g_A)^2 \frac{1}{8f_\pi^2} \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2) \right\} F_V(q^2), \quad (\text{A74})$$

after invoking the Goldberger-Treiman relation  $f_\pi g_{\pi qq} = m$  once more. Thus the electromagnetic form factor of the pion has the required property,  $F_\pi(0) = 1$ , that avoids charge renormalization.

## 6. Evaluation of the ENJL Feynman diagrams that enter into $\Delta m_\pi^2$

In this section, we obtain closed forms for the Feynman diagrams shown in Fig. 20 that enter into  $\Delta m_\pi^2$ . We start with the scattering diagram in Fig. 20(a). Translating the diagram, one finds in the chiral limit for the external pion that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{i} \left\{ \Pi_{EM}^{T_3}(0) \right\}_{scatt} &= ie^2 N_c \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} \left\{ \text{tr}(T_f^\dagger e_q T_i e_q) g_{\mu\nu} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \text{tr}(T_f^\dagger \frac{\tau_3}{2} T_i \frac{\tau_3}{2}) \left( \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2) D_T^{VV}(q^2) \right)^2 T_{\mu\nu} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - [\text{tr}(T_f^\dagger e_q T_i \frac{\tau_3}{2}) + \text{tr}(T_f^\dagger \frac{\tau_3}{2} T_i e_q)] \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2) D_T^{VV}(q^2) T_{\mu\nu} \right\} I^{\mu\nu}(q^2), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A75})$$

with

$$I^{\mu\nu}(q^2) = \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \text{tr}[\gamma_5 S(p+q) \gamma_\mu S(p) \gamma_5 S(p) \gamma_\nu S(p+q)]. \quad (\text{A76})$$

As before,  $e_q = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{3} + \tau_3)$  is the quark electric charge in units of  $e$ , and  $T_f^\dagger$  and  $T_i$  are isospin creation and destruction operators for the initial and final pion channels. The photon propagator is in the Feynman gauge of Eq. (4.16). In obtaining these results, we have used the fact that the effective  $\gamma qq$  vertex, including  $\rho^0$  exchange, is given by Eq. (4.1), i.e.

$$-ieJ_\mu^{(em)}(q^2) = -ie[e_q \gamma_\mu + \frac{1}{i} \Pi_T^{VV}(q^2) \frac{1}{i} D_T^{VV}(q^2) T_{\mu\nu} (\frac{1}{2} \tau_3 \gamma^\nu)]. \quad (\text{A77})$$

The values of the isospin traces in  $\Pi_{EM}^{T_3}$  of course depend on the charge channel  $T_3$  in question. They are listed in Table VII. We are, however, only interested in the difference  $\Pi_{EM}^\pm - \Pi_{EM}^0$ . With the help of the isospin table, one finds the surprisingly simple result for this difference,

$$\frac{1}{i} \left\{ \Pi_{EM}^\pm - \Pi_{EM}^0 \right\}_{scatt} = -ie^2 N_c \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} \left\{ L_{\mu\nu} + T_{\mu\nu} F_V^2(q^2) \right\} I^{\mu\nu}(q^2), \quad (\text{A78})$$

after using  $g_{\mu\nu} = L_{\mu\nu} + T_{\mu\nu}$  and inserting the explicit form of the transverse  $\rho^0$  meson mode propagator from Eq. (2.52), plus the definition of the vector form factor from Eq. (2.88).

Finally we compute  $I^{\mu\nu}(q^2)$ . From its spinor structure,  $I^{\mu\nu}(q^2)$  has to be a linear combination of the longitudinal and transverse projections with coefficients that are only functions of  $q^2$ . Upon evaluating the integral, one in fact finds that the two coefficients are equal, and

$$I^{\mu\nu}(q^2) = -4I(q^2)g^{\mu\nu} \quad (\text{A79})$$

where  $I(q^2)$  is defined by Eq. (A5). Consequently,

$$\frac{1}{i}\{\Pi_{EM}^\pm - \Pi_{EM}^0\}_{scatt} = 4ie^2 N_c \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} I(q^2) + 12ie^2 N_c \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} I(q^2) F_V^2(q^2).$$

We eliminate  $I(q^2)$  in favor of the pion form factor  $F_P(q^2)$  and pion decay constant  $f_p$ , Eqs. (2.32c) and (2.32a), that refer to the mean field calculation, to obtain the result quoted in the main text as Eq. (4.17),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{i}\{\Pi_{EM}^\pm - \Pi_{EM}^0\}_{scatt} &= -e^2 \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} F_P(q^2) \\ &\quad - 3e^2 \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} F_P(q^2) F_V^2(q^2) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A80})$$

The next task is to evaluate the dumbbell diagrams of Fig. 20(b). Due to the presence of the electromagnetic vertices they contain, there is only a contribution in the charged channels from these diagrams. Let us start with the diagram where a pion is exchanged in the intermediate state. Label this diagram  $\Pi_{EM}^{(\pi)}$ . Moving immediately to the chiral limit for the external pions, one obtains

$$\frac{1}{i}\Pi_{EM}^{(\pi)}(0) = \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} V_\mu^{(em)}(0, q) \lambda_\pi(q^2) g^{\mu\nu} D_{PP}(q^2) V_\nu^{(em)}(q, 0). \quad (\text{A81})$$

The  $\gamma\pi\pi$  electromagnetic vertex is given by Eq. (A72), and the pion eigenmode propagator can be identified from Eq. (2.67). This expression does not yet contain the contributions from the three remaining diagrams of Fig. 20(b) that involve the  $\rho^0$  meson to photon conversion in the intermediate state. However, none of these diagrams contribute in the chiral limit as we now show. From Eq. (A72), the half off-shell behavior of the electromagnetic vertex is

$$V_\mu^{(em)}(0, q) = V_\mu^{(em)}(q, 0) = -e_\pi \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} F_P(q^2) \left( \cos \theta - \frac{2m}{\sqrt{q^2}} \sin \theta \right) q_\mu \quad (\text{A82})$$

in the chiral limit, which is purely longitudinal. Consequently the additional  $\rho^0$  meson diagrams, which are automatically included together with the direct photon exchange by writing

$$V_\mu^{(em)}(0, q) \rightarrow [L_{\mu\nu} + F_V(q^2) T_{\mu\nu}] V^{(em);\nu}(0, q), \quad (\text{A83})$$

as in Eq. (A61), fail to contribute in this case due to the longitudinal nature of  $V_\mu^{(em)}(0, q)$ ; the transverse piece has been projected out completely. The corresponding diagram for the  $a_L$  exchange has exactly the same form and properties. We simply must substitute the eigenvalue  $\lambda_{a_L}(q^2)$  for  $\lambda_\pi(q^2)$  in Eq. (A81). Then the  $\pi$  and  $a_L$  exchanges taken together contribute an amount

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{i}\Pi_{EM}^{(\pi+a_L)}(0) &= e^2 \left(\frac{f_p^2}{m^2}\right)^2 \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} \left\{ \lambda_\pi(q^2) \left[ (\cos^2 \theta + \frac{4m^2}{q^2} \sin^2 \theta) - \frac{4m}{\sqrt{q^2}} \sin \theta \cos \theta \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda_{a_L}(q^2) \left[ (\sin^2 \theta + \frac{4m^2}{q^2} \cos^2 \theta) + \frac{4m}{\sqrt{q^2}} \sin \theta \cos \theta \right] \right\} D^{PP}(q^2) F_P^2(q^2), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A84})$$

the factor  $1/q^2$  from the photon propagation having cancelled against a similar factor coming from the contraction of the two electromagnetic vertices. The combinations appearing in the integrand have the values

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_\pi \cos^2 \theta + \lambda_{a_L} \sin^2 \theta &= \frac{\lambda_\pi + \lambda_{a_L}}{2} + \frac{\lambda_\pi - \lambda_{a_L}}{2} \cos 2\theta = A \\ (\lambda_\pi - \lambda_{a_L}) \sin \theta \cos \theta &= \frac{\lambda_\pi - \lambda_{a_L}}{2} \sin 2\theta = B \\ \lambda_\pi \sin^2 \theta + \lambda_{a_L} \cos^2 \theta &= \frac{\lambda_\pi + \lambda_{a_L}}{2} - \frac{\lambda_\pi - \lambda_{a_L}}{2} \cos 2\theta = C \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A85})$$

from the properties of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors given by Eqs. (2.64) and (2.65). The value of the contents of the curly brackets in the integrand of Eq. (A84) is thus

$$\{ \dots \} = \left\{ A + \frac{4m^2}{q^2} C - \frac{4m}{\sqrt{q^2}} B \right\} = 1 - 8G_2 f_\pi^2(q^2) = \frac{1}{1 + 8G_2 f_p^2(q^2)}, \quad (\text{A86})$$

after inserting the values of  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  from Eqs. (2.59) to (2.60) and using the definition of  $f_\pi^2(q^2)$  from Eq. (2.41). Since the renormalized pion propagator of Eq. (2.61) contains the inverse of the same factor,

$$D^{PP}(q^2) = g_p^2 [1 + 8G_2 f_p^2(q^2)] \frac{1}{q^2 F_P(q^2)} \quad (\text{A87})$$

this factor cancels out in the final expression for the integrand, together with one of the  $F_P(q^2)$ 's. Hence we obtain the simple expression

$$\frac{1}{i}\Pi_{EM}^{(\pi+a_L)}(0) = e^2 \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} F_P(q^2) \quad (\text{A88})$$

as the final result after using the Goldberger-Treiman relation  $f_p^2 g_p^2 = m^2$  for the mean field quantities once again. The final answer in fact coincides with the NJL result where no vector mesons are present [15].

The calculations of the dumbbell diagrams involving the  $a_1$  and  $\rho$  mesons follow an identical pattern. The basic electromagnetic vertex for these two cases is obtained by replacing one of the incoming (or outgoing)  $\pi$ 's in Fig. 16 by an  $a_1$  or a  $\rho$  respectively. In the first case this leads to

$$V_{\mu\nu}^{(\gamma\pi a_1)}(k', k) = V_{\mu}^{PA_\nu}(k', k)(\cos\theta' - \frac{2m}{\sqrt{k'^2}}\sin\theta') + ie_\pi[\Pi_{\mu\nu}^{AA}(k^2) - \Pi_{\mu\nu}^{VV}(q^2)]\frac{\sin\theta'}{\sqrt{k'^2}} \quad (\text{A89})$$

for an incoming  $a_1(k)$  and outgoing  $\pi(k')$ ; here  $q_\mu = (k' - k)_\mu$  is the momentum transferred by the photon. The required half off-shell value in the chiral limit is

$$V_{\mu\nu}^{(\gamma\pi a_1)}(0, q) = V_{\mu}^{PA_\nu}(0, q)[1 - 8G_2f_\pi^2] + i\frac{e_\pi}{m}8G_2f_\pi^2[\Pi_{\mu\nu}^{AA}(q^2) - \Pi_{\mu\nu}^{VV}(q^2)], \quad (\text{A90})$$

due to the limiting values  $\cos\theta' \rightarrow 1$  and  $2m\sin\theta'/\sqrt{k'^2} \rightarrow 8G_2f_\pi^2$  for the emitted chiral pion. But the axial vector minus vector polarization equals  $4f_p^2F_P(q^2)$  according to the Ward identity (2.37), and

$$V_{\mu}^{PA_\nu}(0, q) = 2ime_\pi\frac{f_p^2}{m^2}F_P(q^2)g_{\mu\nu}, \quad (\text{A91})$$

that follows immediately from the relation (A67) and the expression (A65) for  $V^{PP}(k', k)$ . The terms involving  $G_2$  cancel, and one is left with  $V_{\mu\nu}^{(\gamma\pi a_1)}(0, q) = V_{\mu}^{PA_\nu}(0, q)$ . The additional three diagrams that include the  $\rho^0$  degrees of freedom can be incorporated into this expression by replacing  $g_{\mu\nu}$  with  $[L_{\mu\nu} + F_V(q^2)T_{\mu\nu}]$  as before. The final expression for the  $\gamma\pi a_1$  vertex including  $\rho^0$  contributions is thus

$$V_{\mu\nu}^{(\gamma\pi a_1)}(0, q) = 2ime_\pi\frac{f_p^2}{m^2}F_P(q^2)[L_{\mu\nu} + F_V(q^2)T_{\mu\nu}] = -V_{\nu\mu}^{(\gamma\pi a_1)}(q, 0). \quad (\text{A92})$$

The structure of the  $a_1$  dumbbell diagram is thus

$$\frac{1}{i}\Pi_{EM}^{(a_1)}(0) = \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4q^2} V_{\mu\nu}^{(\gamma\pi a_1)}(0, q)g^{\mu\mu'}D_T^{AA}(q^2)T^{\nu\nu'}V_{\mu'\nu'}^{(\gamma\pi a_1)}(q, 0). \quad (\text{A93})$$

In contrast with the case of  $\pi + a_L$  exchange in Eq. (A84) where the transverse part of the vertex involving  $F_V(q^2)$  fell away, here only the transverse part of  $V_{\mu\nu}^{(\gamma\pi a_1)}(0, q)$  survives due to the transverse nature of the  $a_1$  mode propagator; now the longitudinal part falls away completely. One has

$$[L_{\mu\nu} + F_V(q^2)T_{\mu\nu}]T^{\nu\nu'}[L_{\mu'\nu'} + F_V(q^2)T_{\mu'\nu'}] = F_V^2(q^2)T_{\mu\mu'}.$$

Using  $g^{\mu\mu'}T_{\mu\mu'} = 3$ , the electromagnetic polarization contribution due to the  $a_1$  exchange becomes

$$\frac{1}{i}\Pi_{EM}^{(a_1)}(0) = 12e^2m^2\left(\frac{f_p^2}{m^2}\right)^2 \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4q^2} F_P^2(q^2)F_V^2(q^2)D_T^{AA}(q^2), \quad (\text{A94})$$

after inserting Eq. (A92).

The basic  $\gamma\pi\rho$  vertex is obtained by replacing the spinor  $A_\nu^a = \gamma_\nu\gamma_5\tau^a$  by  $V_\nu = \gamma_\nu\tau^a$  in Eq. (A64b). Then this diagram assumes the same structure as the anomalous  $\pi^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$  vertex, see for example Ref. [18], p 552. After attaching the photon to both the quark and antiquark lines, and adding, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} V_\mu^{PV_\nu}(k', k) &= (-eN_c)tr(\{T_f^\dagger, T_i\}e_q) \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} tr[\gamma_5 S(p+k')\gamma_\mu S(p+k)\gamma_\nu S(p)] \\ &= \left(-\frac{2}{3}eN_c\right)(4im\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}k'^\rho k^\sigma) \times J(k', k), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A95})$$

since the trace that arises in the numerator of the integrand after inserting the quark propagators has the value  $4im\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}k'^\rho k^\sigma$ . The factor  $J(k', k)$  is the integral

$$J(k', k) = \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{[(p+k')^2 - m^2][(p+k)^2 - m^2][p^2 - m^2]}. \quad (\text{A96})$$

The three additional diagrams containing the  $\rho^0$  can be incorporated by including the factor  $[L_{\mu\mu'} + F_V(q^2)T_{\mu\mu'}]$  as before, and we obtain the final result

$$V_{\mu\nu}^{(\gamma\pi\rho)}(k', k) = -\frac{8}{3}ieN_cmJ(k', k)[L_{\mu\mu'} + F_V(q^2)T_{\mu\mu'}]\varepsilon^{\mu'}_{\nu\rho\sigma}k'^\rho k^\sigma. \quad (\text{A97})$$

The half off-shell value of this vertex is zero in the chiral limit,  $V_{\mu\nu}^{(\gamma\pi\rho)}(0, q) = 0$ , so the dumbbell diagram with a  $\rho$  replacing the  $a_1$  vanishes.

## 7. Dashen's theorem

The complete set of diagrams that determine the corrections to the pion polarization to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha N_c)$  are shown in Figs. 19 and 20. We have already calculated the scattering and meson pole, or dumbbell contributions of Fig. 20 in the previous section. The remaining diagrams in Fig. 19 dress either the quark or antiquark line, i.e. they change the quark mass circulating in the polarization loop. Since the quark and the antiquark lines are dressed identically by the same interaction to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ , both diagrams have the same structure apart from their isospin weights. One finds for Fig. 19 (a)+(b) that

$$\Pi_{EM}^{(a+b)}(0) = -e^2N_c \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4q^2} \left\{ 2tr(e_q^2)g^{\mu\nu} + (F_V^2(q^2) - 1)T^{\mu\nu} \right\} M_{\mu\nu}, \quad (\text{A98})$$

where

$$M_{\mu\nu} = \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \text{tr} [\gamma_5 S(p) \gamma_\mu S(p+q) \gamma_\nu S(p) \gamma_5 S(p)]. \quad (\text{A99})$$

But

$$g^{\mu\nu} M_{\mu\nu} = 4[I(q^2) + I(0) - (q^2 + 2m^2)K(q^2)] \quad \text{and} \quad L^{\mu\nu} M_{\mu\nu} = 2I(q^2), \quad (\text{A100})$$

where we have defined

$$K(q^2) = \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{[(p+q)^2 - m^2][p^2 - m^2]^2}. \quad (\text{A101})$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{EM}^{(a+b)}(0) &= e^2 N_c \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} \left\{ 8 \text{tr}(e_q^2) [-I(q^2) - I(0) + (q^2 + 2m^2)K(q^2)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (F_V^2(q^2) - 1)[2I(q^2) + 4I(0) - 4(q^2 + 2m^2)K(q^2)] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A102})$$

Diagrams 18(c) and 18(d) involve the dressing of the quark and antiquark lines via the exchange of a  $\sigma$  mode with the condensate. The sum of these diagrams can be expressed in terms of the quark electromagnetic self-energy  $\Sigma_{EM}$ , since the  $\sigma$  propagator terminates on an electromagnetic self-energy insertion of the full quark self-energy:

$$\Pi_{EM}^{(c+d)}(0) = -\frac{\Sigma_{EM}}{2m}, \quad (\text{A103})$$

One has

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{EM} &= (e^2 G_1 N_c) \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} \left\{ [2 \text{tr}(e_q^2) + (F_V^2(q^2) - 1)] J_\mu^\mu(q^2) \right\} \\ &= (8e^2 m G_1 N_c) \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} \left\{ [2 \text{tr}(e_q^2) + (F_V^2(q^2) - 1)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times [I(q^2) - I(0) + (q^2 + 2m^2)K(q^2)] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A104})$$

using

$$\begin{aligned} J_\mu^\mu(q^2) &= \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \text{tr} [\gamma_\mu S(p+q) \gamma^\mu S(p) S(p)] \\ &= 8m[I(q^2) - I(0) + (q^2 + 2m^2)K(q^2)] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A105})$$

The total contribution to the pion polarization from Fig. 19 is then given by the sum

$$[\Pi_{EM}^{(a+b)}(0) + \Pi_{EM}^{(c+d)}(0)] = -e^2 N_c \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} \left\{ 16 \text{tr}(e_q^2) + 6(F_V^2(q^2) - 1) \right\} I(q^2) \quad (\text{A106})$$

On the other hand the polarization contribution due to the interaction of like-flavored  $\bar{q}q$  pairs in the  $T_3 = 0$  channel can be found from Eq. (A75). It is

$$\{\Pi_{EM}^0(0)\}_{scatt} = e^2 N_c \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} \{16 \text{tr}(e_q^2) + 6(F_V^2(q^2) - 1)\} I(q^2). \quad (\text{A107})$$

This is *precisely* the negative of the sum in Eq. (A106). If we convert these two expressions into pion self-energies by supplying the missing coupling constant  $(ig_{\pi qq})^2$  and using  $F_P(q^2) = I(q^2)/I(0)$  plus the GT relation  $f_{\pi qq}^2 g_{\pi qq}^2 = m^2$  of the ENJL model, one reaches the final conclusion that

$$\Sigma_{self} = -\Sigma_{scatt}^0 = ie^2 g_A^{-1} \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 q^2} \left\{ 4 \text{tr}(e_q^2) + \frac{3}{2}(F_V^2(q^2) - 1) \right\} F_P(q^2). \quad (\text{A108})$$

This shows the exact cancellation between the self-energy of the neutral pion that arises from the electromagnetic self-energies of the quarks it contains, and the self-energy due to their electromagnetic interaction, and illustrates how Dashen's theorem is realized in the ENJL model. A direct comparison of the various self-energies is given in Fig. 21. One sees there that  $\Sigma_{self} > 0$ , and that the scattering contribution is the negative of this, in agreement with the attractive electromagnetic interaction between like-flavored  $\bar{q}q$  pairs.



## REFERENCES

- <sup>†</sup> On leave from the Physics Department, University of the Witwatersrand, P.O. WITS 2050, Johannesburg, South Africa.
- [1] S. Narison, QCD Spectral Sum Rules, World Scientific Lecture Notes (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989) Vol. 26; P. Frampton, *Gauge Field Theories*, (Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, 1987).
  - [2] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **18** (1967), 507.
  - [3] C. Bernard et al., Phys. Rev. **D 12** (1975), 792.
  - [4] S. Weinberg, Physica **A 96** (1979), 327.
  - [5] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **158** (1984), 142; J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. **B 250** (1985), 465; H. Leutwyler, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **235** (1994), 165.
  - [6] For recent reviews of chiral perturbation theory, see H. Leutwyler, Chiral effective lagrangians, Lecture Notes in Physics, vol.396, eds. H. Mitter and H. Gausterer, Springer-Verlag (Berlin 1991); U.G. Meißner, Rep. Prog Phys. **56** (1993), 903; J.F. Donoghue, E. Golowich and B.R. Holstein, *Dynamics of the Standard Model* (1992), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
  - [7] Y. Nambu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **4** (1960), 380; Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, Phys. Rev. **122** (1961), 345; Phys. Rev. **124** (1961), 246.
  - [8] S. Klimt, M. Lutz, U. Vogl and W. Weise, Nucl. Phys. **A 516** (1990), 429.
  - [9] U. Vogl and W. Weise, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **27** (1991), 195.
  - [10] S.P. Klevansky, Rev. Mod. Phys. **64**(1992), 649 .
  - [11] T. Hatsuda and T. Kunihiro, Phys. Rep. **247** (1994), 221.
  - [12] J. Bijnens and E. de Rafael, Phys. Lett. **B273** (1991), 483.
  - [13] J. Bijnens, E. de Rafael, and H. Zheng, Z. Phys. C **64** (1994), 475.
  - [14] R. Dashen, Phys. Rev. **183** (1969), 1245.
  - [15] V. Dmitrašinović , H.-J. Schulze, R. Tegen and R. H. Lemmer, Phys. Rev. **D52** (1995), 2855.

- [16] V. Dmitrašinović, H.-J. Schulze, R. Tegen and R. H. Lemmer, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **238** (1995), 332.
- [17] V. Dmitrašinović, S.P. Klevansky and R.H. Lemmer, *Phys. Lett. B* **386** (1996), 45.
- [18] C. Itzykson and J.B. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory*, (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980).
- [19] P. Langacker and H. Pagels, *Phys. Rev.* **D8** (1973), 4620; H. Pagels, *Phys. Rep.* **16C**, 219 (1974); W. Marciano and H. Pagels, *Phys. Rep.* **36C**, 137 (1978).
- [20] H.-J. Hippe and S.P. Klevansky, *Phys. Rev.* **C52** (1995), 2172.
- [21] J. Müller and S. P. Klevansky, *Phys. Rev.* **C50** (1994), 410.
- [22] B.R. Holstein, *Comments Nucl. Part. Phys.* **19** (1990), 221.
- [23] U. Bürgi, *Phys. Lett.*, **B 377** (1996), 147.
- [24] J. Boyer et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D42** (1990), 1350.
- [25] D. Babusci et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B277** (1992), 158.
- [26] Yu.M. Antipov, *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **121B** (1983), 445 ; *Z. Phys.* **C24** (1984), 39.
- [27] T.A. Aibergenov, *Czech. J. Phys.* **B 36** (1986), 948.
- [28] J. Portolés and M.R. Pennington, *The Second DAΦNE Physics Handbook*, L. Maiani, G. Pancheri and N. Paver, eds., (INFN, Frascati, 1995), p. 57
- [29] T. Das *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **18** (1967), 759.
- [30] M. Takizawa, K. Kubodera and F. Myhrer, *Phys. Lett. B* **261** (1991), 221.
- [31] See for example, R.G. Sachs, *Nuclear Theory* (Addison-Wesley, Reading Mass., 1953).
- [32] See, for example, C.M. Ko, G.Q. Li, G.E. Brown and H. Sorge, *Nucl. Phys.* **A610** (1996), 342c.
- [33] Review of Particle Properties, *Phys. Rev.* **D54**, Part I (1996), 1.
- [34] J. L. Gervais and B. W. Lee, *Nucl. Phys.* **B12** (1969), 627.
- [35] G. 't Hooft, *Phys. Rev.* **D14**, 3432 (1976); (E) *ibid.* **D18** (1978), 2199.
- [36] S. Gasiorowicz and D.A. Geffen, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **41** (1969), 531.
- [37] R. Willey, *Phys. Rev.* **D48** (1993), 2877.

- [38] R. Urech, Nucl. Phys. **B433** (1995), 234.
- [39] M. Gell-Mann, R. Oakes, and B. Renner, Phys. Rev. **174** (1968), 2196.
- [40] B. Holstein, Phys. Lett. **B244** (1990), 83.
- [41] M. Rho, Nucl. Phys. **A231** (1974), 493.
- [42] M. Wakamatsu, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **193** (1989), 287.
- [43] J.J. Sakurai, *Currents and Mesons* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1969); R. P. Feynman, *Photon-Hadron Interactions* (Benjamin, Reading, MA, 1972); D. Gross and H. Pagels, Phys. Rev. **172** (1968), 1381.
- [44] K.Kawarabayashi and M. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16** (1966), 255.
- [45] D. Ebert and H. Reinhardt, Nucl. Phys. **B271** (1986), 188.
- [46] R.G. Newton, *Scattering Theory of Waves and Particles* (McGraw-Hill, NewYork ) 1966.
- [47] H.T. Nieh, Phys. Rev. **163** (1967), 1769; R. Jackiw, Phys. Lett. **B 27**, (1968) 96.
- [48] R. Tarrach, Z. Phys. **C2** (1979), 221 .
- [49] E.B. Dally *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48** (1982), 375.
- [50] S.R. Amendolia *et al.*, Nucl. Phys., **B277** (1986), 168.
- [51] Time-like: V. L. Auslander *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **25B** (1967), 433; J. E. Augustin *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **20** (1968), 126; *ibid.* Phys. Lett. **28B** (1969), 508; M. Bernardini *et al.*, Phys. Lett. *B46* (1973), 261. D. Bisello *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B220** (1989), 321. Space-like: C. J. Bebek *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D 17** (1978), 1693; C. Mennessier, Z. Phys., **C 12** (1983), 241; S.R. Amendolia *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **146 B** (1984), 116.
- [52] J. Bijnens and F. Cornet, Nucl. Phys. **B296** (1987), 557.
- [53] T. Das, V. Mathur and S. Okubo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **19** (1967), 859.
- [54] T.E.O. Ericson and J. Hüfner, Nucl. Phys. **B57** (1973), 604.
- [55] M.J. Lavelle, N.F. Nasrallah and K. Schilcher, Phys. Lett., **B 335** (1994), 211.
- [56] J.F. Donoghue and B.R. Holstein, Phys. Rev. **D40** (1989), 2378.
- [57] W.A. Bardeen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** (1989), 1343; R.D. Peccei and J. Sola, Nucl. Phys. **B281** (1987), 1.

- [58] I.S. Gerstein, B. W. Lee, H.T. Nieh and H.J. Schnitzer, Phys. Rev. Lett., **19** (1967), 1064.
- [59] V. Bernard, R.L. Jaffe and U.-G. Meissner, Nucl. Phys. **B 308** (1988), 753.
- [60] D. J. Gross, S. B. Treiman and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. **D19** (1979), 2188.

## FIGURES

FIG. 1. Modification of the quark axial isospin current vertex due to the exchange of the pion plus longitudinal axial eigenmode, and the transverse  $a_1$  mode. Quark propagation is shown as solid lines, mesons as broken lines. The wavy line represents an isospin current component of momentum  $q$  entering the vertex.

FIG. 2. Self-energy diagrams entering the non-chiral gap equation to  $\mathcal{O}(\hat{m})$  for  $m^*$ . (a) The Hartree contribution  $-i\Sigma_H$  in Eq. (2.34). In this figure, (b)+(c) represent the non-chiral corrections arising from a finite current quark mass,  $-i\hat{m}$ , denoted by the cross. The  $\sigma$  mode exchange is denoted by the double solid line.

FIG. 3. Behavior of the quark mass and condensate density as a function of the ratio  $x = \Lambda^2/m^2$ . The upper pair of curves labelled  $m$  and  $-\langle\bar{q}q\rangle^{1/3}$  refer to the ENJL calculation with  $f_\pi = 93\text{MeV}$  and  $g_A = 0.75$ . The lower pair of curves refer to the results for the NJL model. They were obtained by scaling the upper pair by  $\sqrt{g_A} = 0.866$ .

FIG. 4. The vector and axial vector spectral densities of the chiral ENJL model versus the momentum transfer squared  $s = q^2$ . The interaction strengths and regulating cutoff are those given in the second line of Table I. The  $\bar{q}q$  threshold then lies at  $4m^2 = (2 \times 0.264\text{GeV})^2 = 0.279\text{GeV}^2$ . The peak values of the vector and axial strengths lie at  $m_\rho^2 = (0.713\text{GeV})^2$  and  $m_{a_1}^2 = (1.027\text{GeV})^2$  respectively that are taken to identify the  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  masses of the ENJL model. Their ratio  $m_{a_1}/m_\rho = \sqrt{2.07}$  lies close to the original Weinberg estimate [2] of  $\sqrt{2}$ .

FIG. 5. Comparison of the PV-regulated density functions of the ENJL and NJL model respectively. The parameters are the same as for Fig. 4. The position and spacings of the  $\bar{q}q$  threshold at  $4m^2 = 0.279\text{GeV}^2$ , and the two thresholds introduced by the Pauli-Villars regularization at  $4m^2(1 + \Lambda^2/m^2) = 4.8\text{GeV}^2$  and  $4m^2(1 + 2\Lambda^2/m^2) = 9.2\text{GeV}^2$  for this parameter choice are also shown. Note (a) the strong redistribution of strength to lower energies of the vector mode, and (b) the strong suppression of the unphysical negative density at large  $s$  for the ENJL case.

FIG. 6. Comparison of the PV-regulated ENJL and NJL strength function differences  $\rho_1^V - \rho_1^A$  and  $\rho_1^{(0)V} - \rho_1^{(0)A}$  as obtained from Eqs. (3.15) and (3.16) and Eqs. (A50) and (A55). The parameters are the same as for Fig. 4. The PV induced thresholds are as described in the previous figure. The strong concentration of strength at much lower energies in the ENJL case is due to the presence of the vector and axial mode form factors that essentially damp out the PV-induced unphysical behavior of the NJL spectral density at energies considerably below the first PV-generated threshold.

FIG. 7. The behavior of the real part of the function  $J(z)$  along the real axis on the first Riemann sheet, and its analytic continuation  $\tilde{J}(z)$  through the cut  $z = 1$  to  $\infty$ , onto the second sheet.

FIG. 8. The behavior of the real part of the vector polarization  $\Pi_T^{VV}(s)$  as a function of the variable  $z = s/4m^2$  on the first and second sheets of the cut  $s$ -plane with the cut running from  $z = 1$  to  $\infty$  along the real axis. The values of the polarization along the upper lip of the cut on the first sheet join smoothly with their analytic continuation onto the lower lip of the cut on the second sheet. At the branch point these values bifurcate into two branches of the function that assume different values along the sector  $0 \leq z \leq 1$  of the two sheets. As explained in more detail in connection with Eq. (A21), the values on the first and second sheets are reached by allowing the variable  $z$  to pass either infinitesimally above or through the cut infinitesimally below the branch point to reach this sector of the real axis. The solid circles indicate the values of  $s/4m^2$  where the polarization function equals  $-1/(8G_2 m^2)$  for the indicated interaction strengths  $G_2$ . These intercepts determine the position of the real poles of vector mode propagator lying in the interval  $0 \leq s/4m^2 \leq 1$ .

FIG. 9. The switch-over of the real pole of the  $\rho$  propagator  $D_T^{VV}$  of Eq. (2.52) from the second to the first Riemann sheet as the interaction strength  $G_2$  increases through the values 2(1) 8, 10 and 16  $\text{GeV}^{-2}$  (solid circles). The critical value of  $G_2$  at which the switch-over from the second to the first sheet occurs is  $G_2^{(c)} = 7.40 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$  in this illustration.

FIG. 10. The positions of the complex poles on the second Riemann sheet of the  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  propagators in Eqs. (2.52) and (2.54) in units of  $4m^2$ . The value of the interaction strength  $G_2$  is recorded in  $\text{GeV}^{-2}$  next to each pole.

FIG. 11. Top figure (a): Comparison of the behavior on the first Riemann sheet of  $Re\bar{\Pi}_T^{JJ}(s)$  for  $J = V, A$  as obtained from an unsubtracted dispersion relation, plotted as a function of  $s = q^2/4m^2$ . The bottom figure, (b), gives the same information for  $Re\Pi_T^{JJ}(s)$ , now obtained from a once subtracted dispersion relation. Note the occurrence of a space-like zero in both functions in this case.

FIG. 12. Landau ghost poles in the  $\rho$ ,  $a_1$ , and  $\pi$  channels. These poles correspond to the space-like roots of the combination  $1 + 2G\Pi(s)$  where the polarization function has been calculated via a once-subtracted dispersion relation. For the vector and axial vector modes,  $G = G_2$  and  $\Pi(s)$  comes from Eqs. (3.21) or (3.23) with the bars removed. The roots corresponding to the resulting  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  ghost modes are almost degenerate at  $s/4m^2 = -18.30$  and  $-18.04$  respectively for the standard parameter set of Table I. For the pion mode,  $\Pi = \hat{\Pi}^{PP}$  of Eq. (2.48) and  $G = -G_1$ . Apart from the expected Goldstone mode for the pion at zero, a second, ghost pole appears at  $s_{\pi g}/4m^2 = -13.48$ . The extensions of the curves beyond the cusp at  $s/4m^2 = 1$  refer to the real part of the corresponding polarization function.

FIG. 13. Comparison of the modulus squared of the exact vector form factor with the single pole approximation. The  $\rho$  pole is located at  $s_\rho = 4m^2(0.522 - 1.326i) = (0.146 - 0.370i)\text{GeV}^2$  on the second Riemann sheet, as illustrated in detail in Fig. 15. Only that part of the approximate curve that lies to the right of the threshold at  $4m^2 = 0.279\text{GeV}^2$ , marked by the cusp in the exact curve, is accessible on the real axis of the physical sheet.

FIG. 14. The same comparison as in Fig. 13 between the exact and single pole approximation, but for the axial form factor  $|G_A(s)|^2$ . In this figure, the  $a_1$  pole lies at  $s_{a_1} = 4m^2(2.123 - 2.141i) = (0.592 - 0.597i)\text{GeV}^2$ .

FIG. 15. Closed integration contour on the first, or physical, Riemann sheet for evaluating the sum rules. The physical cut starts at  $s = 4m^2$ . Additional poles can appear on the real axis of this sheet at bound states of the  $\bar{q}q$  system in  $0 < s < 4m^2$  if  $G_2$  is large enough, or as ghost poles in  $-\infty < s < 0$ . As discussed in the main text, such ghosts only appear if once-subtracted dispersion relations are used in the construction of the propagators. The crosses indicate the pole positions of the virtual  $\rho$  mode at 0.1658, and complex  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  modes at  $0.5221 - 1.326i$  and  $2.1227 - 2.1405i$  respectively in units of  $4m^2$  for the standard parameter set of Table I. As these singularities all lie on the second sheet, they do not fall within the integration contour.

FIG. 16. The  $\gamma\pi\pi$  electromagnetic vertex for absorbing a photon of four momentum  $q = k' - k$ , where  $k$  and  $k'$  are the initial and final pion four momenta. Quark propagators are shown as solid lines, pions as broken lines and photons as wavy lines. In this figure, the small open circle represents the  $qq$  vertex of Fig. 1 with the isospin current replaced by the electromagnetic current. Thus the pseudoscalar and pseudovector exchange contributions in that diagram are to be replaced by  $\rho^0$  exchange, indicated by the heavy solid line.

FIG. 17. The space- and time-like behavior of the electromagnetic form factor  $|F_\pi(q^2)|^2$  of the pion. The experimental data (open circles) have been compiled from the various sources listed under Ref. [51]. The calculated value of this quantity from the ENJL model is given by Eq. (4.2). The modulus squared of this expression has been plotted as a solid line. Although the ENJL model is restricted to low energies as an effective theory, where the agreement is quantitatively significant, the plot has been extended to cover the full range of available data. The possibility of  $\rho - \omega$  mixing as evidenced by the interference structure around  $q^2 \sim 3\text{GeV}^2$  has not been considered in the ENJL model employed in this paper.

FIG. 18. The calculated electromagnetic mass squared splitting of the pion as a function of the photon cutoff squared,  $\lambda_{photon}^2$  for the standard parameter set of Table I. The observed value of the splitting,  $\Delta m_\pi^2 = 1261\text{MeV}^2$  is indicated by the horizontal line. This value of the splitting is obtained for  $\lambda_{photon}^2 = (1.27\text{MeV})^2$ .

FIG. 19. The complete set of pion polarization diagrams to  $\mathcal{O}(N_c)$ , where the mass of either the quark or the antiquark line is renormalized to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ . The conventions are the same as in Fig. 16. The double solid line indicates the exchange of the  $\sigma$  mode of the model.

FIG. 20. The two classes of irreducible pion polarization diagrams involving single photon exchange that determine the electromagnetic mass splitting of the charged to neutral pions to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ : (a) diagrams that describe the scattering of  $\bar{q}q$  pairs in the intermediate state, and (b) meson pole, or “dumbbell” diagrams where the exchange of the  $\pi + a_L$  and  $a_1$  meson eigenmodes together with the photon between identical vertices occurs. The conventions are the same as in Fig. 16. There is no contribution from the dumbbell diagram with a  $\rho$  substituted for an  $a_1$  in the chiral limit. The small circle at a photon vertex indicates that  $\rho^0$  exchange has to be included as in Fig. 16. As a consequence, both diagrams are actually a sum of four diagrams. In (c) we have written out this sum explicitly for the dumbbell diagram.



FIG. 21. Breakdown of the  $U_V(1) \times SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2)$  chiral symmetry of the original ENJL Lagrangian into  $U_A(1) \times U_V(1)$  by the photon gauge field. This is the origin of the electromagnetic mass of the Goldstone pions of the ENJL model. The physical mechanism that keeps the neutral chiral pion massless in agreement with Dashen's theorem is illustrated explicitly, with the mass shift  $\Sigma_{self}$  being exactly cancelled out by the internal electromagnetic interaction  $\Sigma_{scatt}$  of the neutral pion.

# TABLES

TABLE I. Comparison of the NJL and ENJL model coupling constants, regulating cutoff, as well as the quark properties they give at  $x = 16$ . The input parameters are  $f_p = 93\text{MeV}$  for the NJL case (first row), and  $f_\pi = 93\text{MeV}$  together with a form factor  $g_A = 0.75$  in the ENJL case (second row). We refer to the latter set of parameters as the standard set in the text.

| $G_1(\text{GeV}^{-2})$ | $G_2(\text{GeV}^{-2})$ | $\Lambda(\text{GeV})$ | $m(\text{MeV})$ | $-\langle\bar{q}q\rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}(\text{MeV})$ |
|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| 3.29                   | 0                      | 0.916                 | 229             | 259                                                 |
| 2.47                   | 3.61                   | 1.058                 | 264             | 299                                                 |

TABLE II. The combination  $\bar{l}_i + \ln(m_\pi^2/\mu^2)$  and  $l_7$  of the chiral perturbation theory coupling constants as given by the ENJL or NJL model.

| $i$ | ENJL                                                            | NJL                              |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 3   | $\{8\pi^2 \frac{f_\pi^2}{m^2}(2g_A - 1) - 4g_A(3g_A - 1)\}g_A$  | $8\pi^2 \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} - 8$   |
| 4   | $\{4\pi^2 \frac{f_\pi^2}{m^2} - 3g_A\}g_A^2$                    | $4\pi^2 \frac{f_p^2}{m^2} - 3$   |
| 5   | $1 + 6g_A^2 + 8\pi^2 \frac{f_\pi^2}{m^2}(\frac{1-g_A^2}{g_A})$  | 7                                |
| 6   | $1 + 12g_A^2 + 8\pi^2 \frac{f_\pi^2}{m^2}(\frac{1-g_A^2}{g_A})$ | 13                               |
| 7   | $\frac{2\hat{m}^2}{g_A} \frac{f_\pi^2}{m_\pi^2}$                | $2\hat{m}^2 \frac{f_p^2}{m_p^2}$ |

TABLE III. Comparison of the Gasser-Leutwyler chiral perturbation theory parameters with the predictions of both the NJL and ENJL model calculations. The relevant input parameters are:  $f_\pi = 93\text{MeV}$ ,  $m_\pi = 135\text{MeV}$ ,  $x = 16$ , and quark masses  $m = 229\text{MeV}$  and  $264\text{MeV}$  for the NJL or ENJL cases as listed in Table I. The contribution from  $-\ln(m_\pi^2/\mu^2)$  with  $\mu = 2m$  is displayed as an intermediate step in both cases.

| Parameter   | Empirical value, Ref. [5] | NJL                  | ENJL                 |
|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| $\bar{l}_3$ | $2.9 \pm 2.4$             | $5.0 + 2.4 = 7.4$    | $4.5 + 2.7 = 7.2$    |
| $\bar{l}_4$ | $4.3 \pm 0.9$             | $3.5 + 2.4 = 5.9$    | $1.5 + 2.7 = 4.2$    |
| $\bar{l}_5$ | $13.9 \pm 1.3$            | $7.0 + 2.4 = 9.4$    | $10.1 + 2.7 = 12.8$  |
| $\bar{l}_6$ | $16.5 \pm 1.1$            | $13 + 2.4 = 15.4$    | $13.5 + 2.7 = 16.2$  |
| $l_7$       | $\sim 5 \times 10^{-3}$   | $1.4 \times 10^{-3}$ | $0.5 \times 10^{-3}$ |

TABLE IV. Comparison of second sheet real and complex poles of the  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  propagators in units of  $4m^2$ . The type of dispersion relation used to generate the polarization amplitude employed in Eqs. (3.22) and (3.25) is indicated on the left. The ghost poles only occur if subtracted dispersion relations are used, and lie on the first, or physical sheet. The input parameters are the standard set as given in the second line of Table I.

|             | $\rho$ pole | $\rho$ pole        | $a_1$ pole         |
|-------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Unsubtr.    | 0.1658      | $0.5221 - 1.3260i$ | $2.1227 - 2.1405i$ |
| Subtr.      | 0.1659      | $0.5557 - 1.3473i$ | $2.2340 - 2.1728i$ |
| Ghost poles | -           | $-18.3038$         | $-18.0418$         |

TABLE V. Comparison of the second sheet complex poles of the  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  propagators and the peak positions in their spectral densities. The complex poles are recorded in the usual form  $s/M = M - i\Gamma$  in order to display a mass and a width contribution. We have used a capital letter for the mass that appears as the real part of the complex pole in order to distinguish it from the lower case  $m_\rho$  and  $m_{a_1}$  that we associate with the position of the peak value of the corresponding spectral function. Parameters are as for Table IV. The experimental  $\rho(770)$  and  $a_1(1260)$  meson masses are given in brackets. The energy unit is MeV.

|               | $\rho$ -mode        | $a_1$ -mode          |
|---------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Pole position | $382 - 970i$        | $770 - 777i$         |
| Peak position | $713 (768 \pm 0.6)$ | $1027 (1230 \pm 40)$ |

TABLE VI. Comparison of the asymptotic behavior as  $|s| \rightarrow \infty$  in the complex  $s$ -plane of Pauli-Villars regulated Feynman loop diagrams, employing either unsubtracted or once-subtracted dispersion relations. The amplitudes that are generated by the first method carry a bar in the main text.

| Amplitude                                | Unsubtr(with bar) | Subtr(without bar) |
|------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| $iI(s)$                                  | $1/s$             | $\ln(-s)$          |
| $\Pi^{PP}(s)$                            | $(1/s) \ln(-s)$   | $-s \ln(-s)$       |
| $\Pi_T^{VV}(s) \sim \Pi_T^{AA}(s)$       | $-(1/s) \ln(-s)$  | $s \ln(-s)$        |
| $F_P(s)$                                 | $-1/s$            | $-\ln(-s)$         |
| $F_V(s) \sim G_A(s)$                     | $1$               | $1/(s \ln(-s))$    |
| $F_P(s)F_V(s)G_A(s)$                     | $-1/s$            | $-1/(s^2 \ln(-s))$ |
| $\rho_1^{(0)V}(s) \sim \rho_1^{(0)A}(s)$ | $-1/s$            | $s$                |
| $\rho_1^V(s) \sim \rho_1^A(s)$           | $-1/s$            | $1/s(\ln s )^2$    |
| $\rho_1^{(0)V}(s) - \rho_1^{(0)A}(s)$    | $-1/s^2$          | positive constant  |
| $\rho_1^V(s) - \rho_1^A(s)$              | $-1/s^2$          | $-1/(s \ln s )^2$  |

TABLE VII. Values of isospin traces

| Trace of                                            | $\pi^+$        | $\pi^-$        | $\pi^0$       |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| $T_f^\dagger e_q T_i e_q$                           | $-\frac{4}{9}$ | $-\frac{4}{9}$ | $\frac{5}{9}$ |
| $T_f^\dagger \frac{\tau_3}{2} T_i \frac{\tau_3}{2}$ | $-\frac{1}{2}$ | $-\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| $T_f^\dagger e_q T_i \frac{\tau_3}{2}$              | $-\frac{1}{3}$ | $-\frac{2}{3}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| $T_f^\dagger \frac{\tau_3}{2} T_i e_q$              | $-\frac{2}{3}$ | $-\frac{1}{3}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| $T_f^\dagger e_q^2 T_i$                             | $\frac{8}{9}$  | $\frac{2}{9}$  | $\frac{5}{9}$ |
| $T_f^\dagger T_i e_q^2$                             | $\frac{2}{9}$  | $\frac{8}{9}$  | $\frac{5}{9}$ |
| $T_f^\dagger e_q \frac{\tau_3}{2} T_i$              | $\frac{2}{3}$  | $\frac{1}{3}$  | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| $T_f^\dagger T_i e_q \frac{\tau_3}{2}$              | $\frac{1}{3}$  | $\frac{2}{3}$  | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| $T_f^\dagger (\frac{\tau_3}{2})^2 T_i$              | $\frac{1}{2}$  | $\frac{1}{2}$  | $\frac{1}{2}$ |

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig2-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig2-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>



This figure "fig1-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig2-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig1-4.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig2-4.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig1-5.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig2-5.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig1-6.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig2-6.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>



This figure "fig1-7.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig1-8.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig1-9.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig1-10.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig1-11.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig1-12.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig1-13.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>

This figure "fig1-14.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9707206v1>